R E P O R T   R E S U M E S

ED 018 443 TE 500 068

ESSAYS, ANALYSIS, AND--BETTER WRITING.
BY- STEWART, DONALD C.
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENG.,CHAMPAIGN,ILL
PUB DATE 68
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$5.12 126P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ENGLISH, *TEXTBOOK EVALUATION, *COMPOSITION (LITERARY), *TEXTBOOK CONTENT, *WRITING EXERCISES, HIGHER EDUCATION, TEXTBOOK RESEARCH, ENGLISH INSTRUCTION, COMPOSITION SKILLS (LITERARY), WRITING SKILLS, TEXTBOOK BIAS, TEXTBOOK STANDARDS, TEXTBOOKS, LITERATURE, RHETORIC, TEXTBOOK SELECTION,

A STUDY OF THE NATURE AND UTILITY OF TYPES OF ESSAY ANTHOLOGIES DESIGNED FOR FRESHMAN COMPOSITION COURSES WAS CONDUCTED IN ORDER TO DETERMINE (1) WHAT ARE THE RATIONALES, ORGANIZATION, CONTENT, AND INSTRUCTIONAL APPARATUS OF THE MOST WIDELY ADOPTED READERS, (2) HAVE THE RATIONALES FOR THEIR USE VARIED SINCE SUCH TEXTS APPEARED, AND (3) IS THE RATIONALE FOR THEIR USE BASED UPON UNCRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT THE RELATION OF READING AND WRITING. OTHER IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS WERE SOURCES--THEIR RANGE AND POINTS OF VIEW. A SECTION ON PROCEDURE DESCRIBES THE METHOD BY WHICH 77 READERS REPRESENTED IN THIS STUDY WERE SELECTED. THE MAJOR PORTION OF THE DOCUMENT CONSISTS OF A DETAILED STUDY OF EIGHT READERS--(1) LOUIS LOCKE, AND OTHERS, "TOWARD LIBERAL EDUCATION," 5TH EDITION, 1967, (2) DOROTHY VAN GHENT AND WILLARD HAAS, "THE ESSENTIAL PROSE," 1965, (3) CHARLES MUSCATINE AND MARLENE GRIFFITH, "THE BORZOI COLLEGE READER," 1966, (4) STANLEY A. CLAYES AND DAVID G. SPENCER, "CONTEXTS FOR COMPOSITION," 1965, (5) SHERIDAN BAKER, "THE ESSAYIST," 1963, (6) JAMES R. KREUZER AND LEE COGAN, "LITERATURE FOR COMPOSITION," 1965, (7) WALLACE L. ANDERSON AND NORMAN C. STAGEBERG, "INTRODUCTORY READINGS ON LANGUAGE," 1966, AND (8) ALBERT GUERARD, AND OTHERS, "THE PERSONAL VOICE," 1964. OTHER CHAPTERS ARE "THE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF ALL 77 READERS" AND "RECOMMENDATIONS." APPENDIXES PROVIDE A SELECTED BIBIлIOGRAPHY AS WELL AS LISTS OF EARLY READERS, READERS REPRESENTED IN THIS STUDY, AND AUTHORS REPRESENTED 10 OR MORE TIMES IN THE ANTHOLOGIES. (BN)

nald C. Stewart
08 Sangamon Dr.
ampaign, Illinois 61820

ED018443

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ESSAYS, ANALYSIS, AND--BETTER WRITING?[1]

by

Donald C. Stewart

Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's Research in Written Composition, published by The National Council of Teachers of English in 1963, lists twenty-four "questions which seem fundamental in the teaching and learning of written composition [which] apparently have gone almost untouched by careful research." (52) Questions nine, nineteen, and twenty from the list on pages 52 and 53 of the report are related: (9) "What are the effects of various kinds and amounts of reading on the quality and kinds of writing a person does? (19) How is writing affected by extensive study and imitation or parody of models? (20) What forms of discourse have the greatest effect on other types of writing? For example, does writing poetry help a writer of reports?" These questions generate a whole set of new questions, about the nature and utility of the types of essay anthologies which are designed for freshman composition courses. For example, what are the rationales, organization, content, and instructional apparatus of the most widely adopted of these readers? Are the rationales for their use very different from what they were when such texts first appeared in the late nineteenth century or have they remained static? Is the rationale for their use based upon a set of assumptions about the relation of reading and writing which have been passed uncritically from generation to generation (Research In Written Composition implies that this is true since truly meaningful studies exploring the relationship between reading and writing have not yet been conducted)? Do typical anthologies draw their materials from a wide range of sources, both contemporary and historical, or do they duplicate each other excessively? Finally, do these sources represent a broad or narrow range of political, social, religious, scientific, and humanistic points of view? This report attempts to answer these questions.

PROCEDURE

To collect a representative group of anthologies, I first prepared a questionnaire for directors of freshman composition programs in a great variety of schools. Eighty-two responded. They represented public and private coeducational universities, colleges, and junior colleges; a public men's university, private men's universities and colleges; and a public coeducational technical school. These schools were in 40 states plus the District of Columbia; 17 of them in the Northeast; 18 in the South-southeast; 28 in the Mid-West; and 19 in the West and

Southwest. The directors responded, sometimes briefly, sometimes in extensive notes, to the following questions: (1) What type of freshman composition course do you now offer? (I have in mind the types of courses defined in the Workshop Reports of College Composition and Communication, October, 1966, pages 175-182.) If your course varies from semester to semester or quarter to quarter, please indicate which type of course you offer in which semester or quarter.

a. Literature centered.

b. Language centered.

c. Rhetoric centered.

d. Communications course.

e. Other.

(2) What anthology (or anthologies) are you using now? (3) How many years have you been using it? (If over five, indicate that. If less than five, please indicate the exact number.) (4) What do you regard as the anthology's principal function in your course?

a. To supply students with prose models for imitation.

b. To help them develop, from analysis of readings, critical habits of thinking which will carry over into their own writing and revising.

c. To supply them with a body of knowledge which they can use as a source for essay topics.

d. Other.

Disregarding temporarily the other parts of the questionnaire, I turned to the responses to question two to help me prepare a book list. From the directors' responses plus my own knowledge of essay anthologies, I drew up a tentative list of approximately 100 titles which fell, roughly, into four groups: (1) the collections of essays on ideas and issues in human society (sometimes arranged by rhetorical categories--forms of discourse or methods of development--and sometimes not); (2) anthologies containing belle-lettres for composition (as distinguished from anthologies for introductory literature courses); (3) anthologies containing essays about language (history, semantics, usage, grammar, etc.) where the subject matter is not overly technical and clearly directed to students in composition classes; and (4) a miscellaneous group including anthologies stressing voice and perception, advice from professional writers to young writers, rhetoric readers, and a very few, which, while not specifically written for the freshman composition course are, because of their subject matter, ideally suited to use in these classes. I did not examine texts designed for communications courses (I am not sufficiently familiar with the nature and aims of such courses to comment with authority on texts for them), pure rhetorics (those explicating either classical or modern rhetorical theory), or the research source books. The criteria which were to determine those anthologies eventually selected for examination were (1) clear indication, from a preface statement or from the nature of the content, that each was written primarily with the freshman composition course in mind and (2) adoption at more than one institution or use by more than 1000 students. Although I anticipated considerable difficulty in obtaining information about adoptions, I was pleased to find publishers both willing and more than eager to supply me with the information I desired. I sent letters to thirty-six publishers; thirty-two responded. In each letter I listed the books published by that company which I anticipated using in the study. The publisher was to indicate only whether or not the titles on the list had been adopted by at least two schools or used by 1000 or more students. I requested more information about eight readers I planned to study in detail. Publishers were to indicate whether or not these had been adopted by either 50 or more schools or used by at least 30,000 students.

The list I eventually settled upon contained 77 titles. Sixty-five, I learned from publishers' figures, which were far more detailed than I requested, are in use at two or more schools. One book was adopted at but one school, but it is a major university which enrolls several thousand freshmen each year. Most of the 11 about which I lacked positive information are widely adopted,I am reasonably certain, from information obtained privately. Most are the products of the one major publishing concern which did not answer my letter. Seven of the eight books I chose for close analysis have been adopted by more than 50 schools or used by more than 30,000 students. The eighth is used by approximately 15,000 students. As a matter of fact, many of the books not chosen for close analysis are widely adopted, by many more than two schools or 1000 students. The significance of this information essentially is that the list of books is representative of the types of books used by large numbers of students in a variety of programs across the nation.

The book list secured, I turned to the plan of the report. I projected detailed studies of the rationales, organization, contents, and instructional apparatus of eight readers representing each of the four types I had recognized. I also projected content analyses of all the readers in the report. Two graduate students at the University of

Illinois were to prepare a separate card for every essay, poem, story, etc. that appeared in these anthologies. On each card were to be the author, title, date, source, type, and frequency of occurence of the item. A synthesis of this information would follow the analysis of the eight major readers. By way of comparison I planned to scan fifteen to twenty readers published between 1886 and 1933 to see how their rationales and contents compared to those of the sixties. The last part was to contain my observations on the nature and usefulness of these anthologies, these observations butressed by a few significant studies in written composition. This report is a realization of the plan I projected.

Before turning to the close analysis of the eight readers, however I wish to return briefly to other information supplied by the directors of composition programs. Their responses to questions one, three, and four of the questionnaire reveal their conceptions of what writing courses are and what should be the function of the anthologies used in them.

Three types of composition programs predominated among the schools to which I sent questionnaires: the literature centered, rhetoric centered, and combined rhetoric-literature centered courses. The first uses belle lettres as the subject matter for theme writing; the second stresses the teaching of rhetorical theory and practice, usually through a contemporary rhetoric textbook (example, Hughes and Duhamel's Rhetoric: Principles and Usage) and a book of essays; the third studies rhetorical theory and practice but uses belle lettres as its material for prose models, analysis, etc. There were only two schools still using the study of language in their freshman courses, none offering the communications course alone. A variety of mixed approaches appeared: language and literature;

language and rhetoric; language, literature, and rhetoric; literature, communications, and speech; and rhetoric and communications.[2]

Of greater significance for this study of textbooks was the information about the number of years individual textbooks had been used in different courses. Most schools use more than one text. I record here only the use of essay anthologies. Thirty-three, I found, had been used for one year only; 32 for but two years; 9 for three years; and only 7 for five or more years. Kitzhaber, citing the fact that in his study seventy-six colleges and universities used fifty-seven different essay anthologies draws some tentative conclusions which apply equally well to the information I have gathered about the rapid turnover in these books: "(1) Many of these books are so nearly alike that it matters little which one is used. (2) Fads and novelties affect choice of these books as much as they do choice of women's hats. (3) Local authorship plays a large part in the decision to adopt one of the books. . . . (4) The glut of these books, all produced by presumably busy scholars, suggests that the job of putting one of them together is considerably less burdensome than the writing of most other kinds of books.[3]" This last conclusion is more than conjecture. An author of one essay anthology candidly admitted to me that he had produced what was, in his words, "a cut and paste job." Other reasons could be offered: instructors' boredom with one book and a desire to change for change's sake; the endless tinkering and changes in freshman composition courses which necessitate changes in textbooks; the proliferation of these books which makes a thorough examination of them impossible. Often a text is adopted, then found to be not workable after several weeks use in the classroom.

Ideally, textbook changes should be preceded by a year's experimentation with them in selected classes taught by instructors whose judgment and reliability in evaluating texts can be trusted.

Of still greater significance for this study was the information obtained from question 4. I realized, of course, that by providing set responses, even though I left open the opportunity for a different response in item d., I encouraged busy administrators to respond with less explicitness, accuracy, and possible oversimplification in describing their courses. They corrected some of the limitations of the question by checking two or more of the categories, indicating frequently that their courses varied from semester to semester or from quarter to quarter. For that reason I indicate here only the frequency with which certain categories were marked. The idea that essays were to supply students with prose models for imitation was checked 24 times; item c., that essays were to supply students with a body of knowledge which they can use as a source for essay topics, was checked 32 times; item b., that the reading of essays helps students develop, from analysis of these readings, critical habits of thinking which will carry over into their own writing and revising, was checked 57 times. Other reasons offered were as follows: to help students develop some intellectual excitement-in-common out of which can come committed writing; to introduce them to methods of development, patterns of organization, and rhetorical techniques which they may use in their own essays (this respondent felt that item a. did not fully describe what he was doing); to introduce them to basic literary forms; to teach understanding of literature; to help them develop reading and study skills needed for success in other college courses.

Despite the difficulties of interpreting the data, one significant fact did appear. A sizable majority of respondents checked item b. in conjunction with one other. I interpret this to mean that despite their differences, many directors of composition courses have at least one common objective. They attempt to use their material to teach better reading and, they feel, better writing. Whether or not skill in the analysis of prose is as helpful to the potential writer as generations of composition teachers have thought is a question which is of great significance in this inquiry and will be taken up later.

EIGHT DIFFERENT AND WIDELY ADOPTED READERS

The heart of this report is the following analysis of eight widely adopted and, apparently, successful anthologies for composition courses. The first three are collections of essays on ideas and issues in human society; the next two are rhetoric readers, collections of essays designed primarily to exemplify certain rhetorical strategies which the students are to master; the sixth is a collection of materials which are entirely belletristic but specifically chosen and designed for use in composition courses; book seven is a widely adopted language reader; the eighth is a collection of essays and belletristic material stressing the recognition of voice. All of these approaches will be discussed more fully in the analyses of individual books.

Passing judgment on textbooks requires the asking of both broad and specific questions. And these questions need to be taken up in a certain order if they are to be meaningful and if the answers to them are to be valid and useful to those concerned with the quality of these texts. All questions about textbooks, I am convinced, are intrinsically related to questions about a book's rationale. It is the author's stated commitment to the way he thinks he can best teach his subject. It involves first the organization of the materials in a textbook. In freshman anthologies, which include many essays, it involves the principle by which the editors arrange the sections of an anthology and their reasons for placing certain essays in certain sequences. It carries over, also, into questions about the quality of the essays offered, and the arrangement of materials in the teaching apparatus offered to instructors who use the text.

Therefore, in dealing with each of the texts which follow, I shall ask the following questions: (1) is the rationale of the book clearly and forcefully stated; (2) does the organization of the materials in the book reflect this rationale; (3) what criteria govern the choice of materials for the book; (4) do the contents of the book seem adequate to fulfill the editors' stated educational purposes; and (5) how thoroughly does the teaching apparatus accompanying the book support its rationale?

Locke, Louis, William M. Gibson, and George Arms, eds, Toward Liberal Education. 5th ed. New York, 1967. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

The editors supply the reader with two statements explaining the rationale of their book. The first, and apparently more important rationale for them, appears in the preface to the text:

> Our constant purpose has been to make an anthology that would help college students understand what liberal education

> can mean to them. . . .Without deviating into models at one time or mere entertainment at another, it seeks systematically to explore the skills and disciplines of our humanistic culture. Second, it makes this exploration by the use of writing chosen for its intrinsic worth. . ." (vii)

The other statement occurs in the preface to *Suggestions for Teachers of Toward Liberal Education*:

> In the beginning, we conceived of a freshman anthology which would present the whole panorama of liberal studies, representing the chief disciplines of the arts, science, the social sciences, philosophy and religion, and imaginative literature, together with those skills which are basic to acquiring a liberal education--learning, reading and writing, and thinking. . . . Since some book of readings is used in most courses in freshman English, we felt that students would be spending their time to good advantage if they read a group of essays ordered to present a synoptic view of liberal education, essays which at the same time were intrinsically interesting and well written. Although several other anthologies also present excellent selections, there is no other that offers readings in this particular meaningful pattern. (iii)

Their rationale for the inclusion of materials which are oriented toward a course in rhetoric, also in the *Suggestions for Teachers*, is as follows:

> In this edition of the book, we have added a number of essays of this rhetorical or argumentative or persuasive kind--so that the instructor who wants to devote a part of his freshman English course to the study of persuasion may now do so more easily with more material, and with recourse to the alternate Table of Contents arranged according to types of writing. Advertisers, salesmen, politicians, the local debate team, and the student in the next seat bombard the freshman daily and hourly with argument either in conversation or through the so-called mass mediums of our time; hence the number of rhetorical essays have been increased in order to prepare him to regard these persuasive efforts critically. (49, 50)

The aims of the editors are reasonably clear and certainly noble, but they contain two ambiguities which need clarification. First, what *are* the *chief* disciplines of the arts, science, the social sciences, etc.? Might there not be some ground for quibbling here? They should indicate in one of these prefaces what they think those disciplines are and why they think so. Second, they list among the skills basic to acquiring a liberal education, "learning" and "thinking." Exactly what kind of distinction do they have in mind? Isn't learning a kind of thinking?

The rhetorical materials seem to be included for a totally pragmatic purpose: to teach the student to analyze rhetorical strategies so that he can cope with those which various individuals and groups in our society employ to change his opinions or support some course of action. Wouldn't a nobler purpose be more in keeping with the tone of this fine book? Couldn't something be said about the relation of rhetoric to the seeking and perception of truth? Or couldn't the editors at least suggest that a firm mastery of rhetoric is one of the attributes of the liberally educated man?[4]

The anthology has seven sections in the following order: I. "Learning"; II. "Reading and Writing"; III. "Thinking"; IV. "The Arts"; V. "Science"; VI. "Society"; VII. "Philosophy and Religion." Sixteen sub-sections are contained in the seven major sections: I. (*Learning*) "The Campus"; Education"; II. (*Reading and Writing*)"Reading"; "Writer to Reader"; "Writing"; III. (*Thinking*) none; IV. (*The Arts*) "The Fine Arts"; "Literature and Criticism"; V. (Science) "The Nature of Science"; "Physical Science"; "Biological Science"; VI. (*Society*) "Sociology"; "Political Philosophy"; "Social Analysis"; VII. (*Philosophy and Religion*) "The Good Life"; "Religion"; "The Nature of Reality"; "Can Philosophy Save Civilization?"

In their rationale the editors say that the book "seeks systematically to explore the skills and disciplines of our humanistic culture." The important question is what they mean by "systematically." Presumably, it means taking up the "skills" (learning, reading and writing, and thinking) first, then presenting the disciplines. If these are the basic skills required for obtaining a liberal education (I hedge because of a previously expressed lack of understanding of their distinction between learning and thinking), then their pedagogical principle can be defended. For example, one must first learn to produce sounds from a violin before he can make music. And the analogy holds good in another way. As one acquires his liberal education (or masters playing the violin), he continually sharpens the skills he has been acquiring. At any rate, the editors do what they say they are going to do in providing readings about the skills first, then the disciplines of liberal education.

In only two places, however, in the Suggestions for Teachers, do the editors attempt to justify the order in which individual major sections appear. They justify opening with "Learning" as follows: "In 'Learning,' the first of the three skills of a liberal education, we have a subject that lends itself to introduction and at the same time points to conclusion. . . .we have wanted to introduce the course, first, with that which is either actually or potentially familiar and, second, with an overview of education that may be related and qualified and expanded with many of the later selections." (1) And they justify the placement of the section of "The Arts" immediately after the first three sections: "The readings in this section of the anthology follow naturally from a group of essays on thinking if the instructor assumes, as the editors have, that the processes of thought and imagination which end in genuine discovery and delight are much alike, whether the end result is a scientific discovery or a work of art." (18)

It is, of course, a violation of the editors' stated purposes to insist too much on reasons for the arrangement of parts in the book. However, while acknowledging their remarks that any teacher may rearrange the sections to suit himself (or the essays within sections, or relate essays in one section to another) one would still like to know why"The Arts"were taken up before"Science,"and why each of these precedes "Society." Someone had to make that decision. Was it made willy-nilly, or purposefully? If purposefully, what was the rationale? Teachers would like to know, not to criticize it, but to think about it. Perhaps it offers a rationale for organization they have not considered. The position of the last section, though not explained, seems implicitly clear. The essays are more abstract, more difficult, and deal with the broadest of issues, those which subsume other areas of study.

The organization of groups of essays within subsections presents some other problems. Several criteria may have been factors in determining their arrangement. First, there is apparent chronological order in the selections. For example, in the sub-section on religion under "Philosophy and Religion" Psalms 8, 53, 23, and 90 precede "The Upanishads," "Augustine's Confessions," Donne's "Meditation XVII," and an encyclical by John the XXIII in that order. The editors also attempt to broaden the discussion of each topic. "Religion," for example, contains Christian, Hindu, and atheist positions. There is no indication that the essays proceed from less complex to more complex. It would be impractical to concentrate, in detail, on all sections of the book. Therefore, I offer here an examination of the arrangement of

subsections?

Donne's?

essays in one section with two sub-sections. The section is "The Arts," the sub-sections "The Fine Arts" and "Literature and Criticism." One arrangement seems so purposeful, the other so haphazard. "The Fine Arts" contains the following essays in this order: (1) Susanne Langer, "The Cultural Importance of the Arts"; (2) Clement Greenberg, "The Case for Abstract Art"; Erwin Panofsky, "Et in Arcadia ego: Poussin and the Elegiac Tradition"; (4) Frank Lloyd Wright, "Modern Architecture: The Cardboard House"; (5) Aaron Copland, "How We Listen"; (6) Arthur Koestler, "Cultural Snobbery." The Langer essay contains broad generalizations about the nature and purpose of the arts. The expectations of the reader are, naturally enough, to find discussion of the cultural importance of the different arts. These expectations are fulfilled. Discussions of painting, architecture, music and the intellectual history of one idea in art follow. Giving strength to the section's unity is the way in which several of the essays offer reinforcement of one of Langer's basic generalizations: that art objectifies certain human perceptions and feelings which are beyond articulation with words. It is a point stressed particularly by Greenberg in his essay on abstract art and by Copland on listening to music. Koestler's remarks on cultural snobbery keep art appreciation in perspective. The section, is, to put it bluntly, beautifully arranged.

Turning to "Literature and Criticism," however, the reader is disappointed. The essays and their order is as follows: (1) René Wellek, "The Main Trends of Twentieth-Century Criticism"; Cleanth Brooks, "The Naked Babe and the Cloak of Manliness"; (3) R. S. Crane, "The Structure of Macbeth"; (4) Francis Fergusson, "Macbeth as the

Imitation of an Action"; (5) Walter Jackson Bate, "Aristotle"; (6) Aristotle, "Poetics"; (7) Lionel Trilling, "Art and Neurosis"; (8) Robert Penn Warren, "A Lesson Read in American Books"; (9) T.S. Eliot, "On Teaching the Appreciation of Poetry." An introductory essay (Wellek's on main currents in twentieth criticism) prepares the reader for a series of essays, discussions of literary works, employing the various types of criticism he discusses. But one's expectations are only partially fulfilled. Wellek mentions six different schools of criticism. The essays which follow, however, offer but two examples of what he calls "a new organistic formalism" (Brooks and Crane) and one modern Aristotelian position (Fergusson). There follow the essay on Aristotle, a large section from the Poetics, Penn Warren's essay on the value of the freedom of the artist, Trilling on art and neurosis, and T. S. Eliot on teaching poetry. The Suggestions for Teachers explains this particular assortment of essays as follows: "The student is given three different approaches to Macbeth [only partially true since two of the three approaches are offshoots of one branch], a play he is probably familiar with. Aristotle is represented extensively because of his importance in the history of criticism. Lionel Trilling deals with opinions about the artist, whose place in and contribution to society are frequently the subject of debate and analysis. Robert Penn Warren continues the examination of the artist, and T. S. Eliot concludes the section with a kind of literary biography which gives important ideas on teaching poetry." (21,22) This is hardly an explanation of the order of materials. The essays sustain the book's broad purpose--to give the student a liberal education--but they do not give any evidence of "systematic presentation." Any user of this book should look for this variation between sections and subsections which are meaningfully arranged and those which are not. The point here is that since the first sub-section of "The Arts" is so well ordered, one cannot be put off by a remark suggesting that a common subject matter unifies the second sub-section. Essays about the artist or about Macbeth are not substitutes for an orderly presentation of critical approaches to literature.[5]

Like most books of readings, this one has the inevitable and unfortunate disclaimer of purpose. It appears twice, once in the preface to the text, once in the Suggestions For Teachers:

> It is not our intention to tell users of Toward Liberal Education how to teach their courses, for we believe that in having provided material of sufficient scope and richness, we have made it possible for each instructor to develop his own course according to his point of view and interests. It is contrary to our educational philosophy to issue any prescription of the way to teach a course in which this book is used, for we know that there is no single right way to organize the course; indeed, a wide variety of ordering and presenting the materials is possible. Thus disclaiming all pretense of superior wisdom, we wish to explain--for whatever value it may have--our original conception of this book, and how we came to present this material in the organization represented in the Table of Contents, how certain essays are related to others, and in some instances the particular significance that we find in an essay, together with a few of our own ideas for presenting material to undergraduate classes. (Suggestions for Teachers, iii)

> The development of all these parts aims at presenting the material to the student with force and meaning. In arranging the parts in their present order, we thus feel that we have provided a sound framework for a course which uses the anthology. Yet we recognize that each school and each teacher may properly wish to rearrange the order of our materials for special needs. As in earlier editions, we have provided teachers with a wide range of materials with the expectation that few will want to assign everything, but with confidence that such abundance of readings provides a latitude of choice which gives individuality and richness to the course. (Preface to the text, vii, viii)

The editors ought *not* to pretend that they lack superior wisdom. The book is a very good one. Surely, their conception, although we might not think it without weaknesses and will most surely tamper with it if we want to and need to for specific courses, does not merit the phrase "whatever value it may have." This kind of academic grovelling ought to be taboo. It may even lead some to look with a cynical eye upon the book. It causes one to suspect that the authors' unexpressed but true purpose was to offer a book that was all things to all teachers. Would they want this to be the reason for the success of their book? And certainly this has been a successful book when adoptions are used as the yardstick of success. Let the editors offer their explanation of the book's rationale and suggestions *without* disclaimers.

Much more satisfying are their remarks about the criteria governing the choice of essays for inclusion in *Toward Liberal Education*:

> We have chosen writing that bears the stamp of permanent value. This standard has not meant that we stayed in the past. But it has meant the exclusion of superficial journalizing and a disregard for the timeliness of yesterday's newspaper. College students, we believe, not only are capable of hard, solid reading, but are happier when they are expected to do it." (Preface to the text, viii)
>
> We have constantly tried to select readings of significant, often permanent, value. Such materials are generally fairly sophisticated, and hence of a fair level of difficulty. But as Alfred North Whitehead sagely observed in *The Aims of Education*, "any textbook which is not difficult deserves to be burned." *Toward Liberal Education* never talks down. It rests upon the basic assumption that most college students are educable and that they deserve to be educated. Hence it does not coddle or insult them by providing reading on a high school level. (*Suggestions for Teachers*, iii, iv)

The editors wanted work which was intellectually tough, significant, and well written. This they have certainly got. One of the book's strengths is the quality of the essays it contains. The past is represented by Bacon, Thoreau, Franklin, Aristotle, Jefferson, Plato, Thucydides, Swift, Buddha, extracts from the Bible, Donne, Descartes, and others. The list is impressive. Equally impressive is the list of contemporary authors, among them Riesman, Hutchins, C. S. Lewis, T. S. Eliot, Orwell, Langer, Frank Lloyd Wright, Trilling, and Russell. Just as important are the works they represent, many of them classics: _Walden_, the _Novum Organum_, the _Poetics_, the _Four Quartets_, _The Well Wrought Urn_, _The Liberal Imagination_, _The Lonely Crowd_, "The Apology of Socrates,""The Funeral Oration of Pericles," "A Modest Proposal."

The instructional apparatus accompanying this book is uneven, some of it being very good and useful, some not so good or useful. The notes on the content of the book and the supplementary historical, biographical, and critical essays are well written. Missing is a ratinnale for the _order_ of questions on any given assignment. At the risk of overgeneralizing, I am going to concentrate on the questions asked about Susanne Langer's essay, "The Cultural Importance of the Arts." These illustrate many of the kinds of questions asked about other essays in the anthology and may, therefore, serve as as a model for analysis.

First, there is the question designed solely to determine whether or not the students have read the material carefully. "Why do cultures develop art?" The second question, attempts to relate this essay to others, a valuable exercise since the authors are concerned that students develop a sense of the interrelationship of knowledge. "How does the statement that art is the epitome of life fit in with Dylan Thomas' conception of his art in 'In My Sullen Craft or [illegible] Art"?"

(Actually, the poem is "In My Craft or Sullen Art"; this is an error which should be corrected in the manual.) A third kind of content question relates the material to the student's experience and knowledge; this, too, is purposeful and relevant to the educational aims of the book. "What implications do her remarks on organic unity, self-sufficiency, and individual reality have for your approach to literature?"

Less useful are questions about the composition of Miss Langer's essay. I enclose criticism and passing observations in parentheses. "What lessons of style may be deduced from Langer's method of organizing her essay?" (How can this question be answered? What precisely is style? What are the lessons one learns about it? What is the implied relationship between style and organization?) "Does she define carefully?" (This question can be answered, but how is it important in relation to the previous question?) "How does she move forward from a definition?" (Better. This does have relevance to the question which precedes it.) "What is the effect of Langer's use of imagery, such as the examples of forms in fog and rain rills?" (What, in this context, is meant by *effect*? Upon the organization of the essay? Upon the reader? Upon the clarity with which her meaning comes through?) "From where does she get her images?" (That can be deduced.) "Why does she take them from such familiar spheres?" (This partially answers the previous question thus reducing its importance.) My criticisms, in short, are that these questions are sometimes ambiguous, and there is no meaningful progression to them.

Much more likely to be useful to both student and teacher are the editors' general suggestions, at the back of the manual, for rhetorical analysis of individual essays. They are systematic and they ask questions which can be answered concretely.

> In rhetorical analysis, the goal sought is simply, "What is the speaker's purpose," overt or concealed? Is it to persuade his audience to immediate action, or to sway their convictions and emotions with ultimate action in mind? Or is it to praise or blame the character or actions of an individual or a group? The means of analysis, equally simple, may be suggested by the following kinds of questions:
>
> 1. What is the occasion of the rhetorical discourse, or speech? That is, what light may be thrown on the speaker's purpose by a clear understanding of the historical situation in which the speech was delivered?
>
> 2. What is the character of the audience whom he is addressing, and what effect does this have on his presentation of his views or arguments? What sort of appeals, furthermore, does he make to them? (A candidate for political office seeking the support of labor unions, for example, would not address them in the same way that he would speak to the National Association of Manufacturers.)
>
> 4. How does the speaker establish his authority? Some kind of impressive introduction may help, but it is still the speaker's task, consciously or not, to convince his audience that he speaks as an expert—that he has special knowledge of his subject or special insight into its complexities.
>
> 4. How good are the speaker's logic and his evidence? What kinds of authority or special testimony does he cite in support of his views and his end?
>
> 5. What literary devices does the speaker use to make his discourse interesting or moving and to hold the unbroken attention of his audience? Figurative language, irony, humor, pathos, parallelisms in syntax and decided prose rhythms, pithy expression, poetic flights may be effectively (and are often bathetically) employed in persuasion. (Suggestions for Teachers, 50,51)

I find these questions superior to those asked over individual essays
tell the teacher how to
because they/approach a piece of writing systematically. The clear progression of concentration from the occasion of the piece of writing to the nature of the audience, to the authority of the speaker, to the quality of his thinking, to the literary devices he employs to make his points effectively offers a solid plan for analysis.

Summing up, I would say of Toward Liberal Education and its instructional apparatus that despite flaws this is an excellent book because of the quality of the essays it contains and their relevance to the book's broad purpose--supplying students with a synoptic view of liberal education. The organization of some sections and the teaching apparatus need strengthening, however, if it is to compare favorably with the following two essay collections, *The Essential Prose* and *The Borzoi College Reader*.

> Van Ghent, Dorothy, and Willard Maas. *The Essential Prose.* Indianapolis, 1965. Bobbs-Merrill.

The Essential Prose has two objectives:

> . . . to provide materials for the teaching of discursive writing, and at the same time to give the student a fairly broad and various acquaintance with his cultural heritage. (vii)

Translated, this means that the book is going to provide not only liberal education (the synoptic view offered by Locke, Gibson, and Arms), but a way to teach writing: by imitation and analysis of prose models. It will do this by presenting essays produced by the best writers and finest minds which have contributed to western culture. The purpose, therefore, is clear. It remains to be seen now how well this purpose is carried out.

The editors offer the following rationale for the organization of the book's content:

> The contents of the book are ordered according to those themes and subjects that mark out the most significant areas of our lives: first, the *individual experience* of adolescence, of the relationship between father and son, of men and women in love, of the stress of the extreme situation where character is tested, of the inevitability and the challenge of death; next the *collective experience* of our social nature and condition, what history has to tell us about that nature and condition, and what we have dreamed collectively as social ideals toward which the human ventures; and finally, some of the *orders of knowledge* by which we strive to

> understand ourselves, the order of the external natural world about us, the order of our own minds, the order of that part of the psyche which we call "soul" or "spirit," the order of creativity in art, and, at the end, a few insights into the process of learning itself. (viii)

Now, this is really an elaboration on the table of contents. What we do not know is why these subjects are taken up in the sequence they are. Presumably, there is a logic in moving from ego-centric concerns to broader social concerns (a movement from man preoccupied with himself to man concerned with his role in society) to the nature of knowledge itself, although the jump from the second to the third area is hard to follow. The obvious counter from the editors would be that any number of arrangements would be satisfactory. That may be true. They still should say what motivated them to organize the large sections of the book in the order they chose.

Although not specifically stated, the editors seem to have worked out some pretty well defined principles of organization in the large category, "The Individual Experience." The sub-headings are as follows: (1) "Private Lives"; (2) "Fathers and Sons"; (3) "Men and Women in Love"; (4) "The Extreme Situation"; (5) "Attitudes Toward Death." Two kinds of organization are implicit in this arrangement. The first involves the chronology of a human life from youth (most of the essays in "Private Lives" are on youthful experience) to parent-child relationships, to love, the most pre-occupying relationship and concern of the mature person, to the quality of the person who faces death, and finally to human attitudes toward this last act in any life. The section is a chronology of those emotional concerns which preoccupy humans at various stages of life. The second organizational pattern is expressed through the content of the sections. The first and the last show man preoccupied with himself. The middle sections show man in his relationships with others. This is thoughtful and laudable planning.

Purposeful planning also exists in the organization of individual essays in sections. The very first section, "The Individual Experience," is a good example. These are its subsections and the essays they contain:

A. Private Lives.
   1. Maxim Gorky, "An End and a Beginning."
   2. W. B. Yeats, "An Irish Boyhood."
   3. Emlyn Williams, "Pubertas, Pubertatis."
   4. Anne Frank, "The Secret Annexe."

B. Fathers and Sons.
   1. Homer, "Priam and Achilles."
   2. Lord Chesterfield, "Letter to his Son."
   3. Sherwood Anderson, "Discovery of a Father."
   4. Franz Kafka, "A Letter to His Father."
   5. Marcel Proust, "Filial Sentiments of a Parricide."

C. Men and Women in Love.
   1. Plato, "The Wisdom of Diotima."
   2. Heloise and Abelard, "Two Letters."
   3. Stendhal, "The Crystallization of Love."
   4. John Keats, "Letters to Fanny Brawne."
   5. Ortega y Gasset, "Toward a Psychology of Love."
   6. Rilke, "The Difficult Work of Love."
   7. D. H. Lawrence, "Love Was Once a Little Boy."

D. The Extreme Situation.
   1. Joan of Arc, "I Have Nothing More to Say."
   2. Robert Scott, "The Last March."
   3. T. E. Lawrence, "Desert Spring."
   4. Hanson Baldwin, "R.M.S. Titanic."
   5. Isak Dinesen, "Shooting Accident on an African Farm."

E. Attitudes Toward Death.
   1. Plato, "The Death of Socrates."
   2. Jessica Mitford, "Mortuary Solaces."
   3. Sir Thomas Browne, "The Dead Eat Asphodels."
   4. Joseph Addison, "Reflections in Westminster Abbey."
   5. Edward Trelawny, "Shelley's Funeral."
   6. Bernard Shaw, "She Would Have Enjoyed It."
   7. André Gide, "The Death of Charles-Louis Philippe."

Chronology certainly seems to determine, except in some cases, the order in which essays are presented. But it is not a chronology governed by dates of publication or even strictly by the birth dates of the authors. Gorky, born three years after Yeats describes an experience which happened probably before he was ten. Thus the events of the essay probably occurred around 1873-78. Yeats' essay touches on a period around 1880-1882. Williams' should be about 1920. Anne Frank's tragic story we know took place between 1942 and 1944. Thus the reader gets a perspective on the young lives of these writers, each time span being later than the previous one. No reason is given for this, but it is fairly obvious that the editors wish the reader to be sensitive to differences and similarities in the experience of being young in any era. They are very specific, however, in stating that their purpose is principally to give a sense of the common experience of youth. And their concentration on adolescence in three of the four essays is also purposeful and laudable. "What is most remarkable and moving in them [these essays] is not their individualizing differences but the common pulse of a universal experience that one feels in each of them. The experience could be defined as initiation into the primal verities." (3)

The startling aspect of this organization by internal chronology is that it is maintained throughout all the sub-sections except in a few instances, one of which can be explained. That is the placing of Jessica Mitford's "Mortuary Solaces" right after Plato's "The Death of Socrates." A contrast is intended between the great Greek's lack of concern for the body and total concern for the spirit set against modern man's almost morbid preoccupation with the flesh, even after death:

Jessica Mitford's The American Way of Death (from which the

> piece "Mortuary Solaces" is drawn) reveals the early illusion become in maturity a deceit practiced on death; though we may admit that we owe a death to nature, we have developed an elaborate machinery for taking the deathiness part out of it. (303)

The editors are also to be commended for excellent prefatory essays before major sections and sub-sections. Though primarily comments on essays, they do provide the rationale which holds them together, usually a thematic rationale.

Unfortunately, despite the generally purposeful organization of materials in this book, the editors descend, momentarily, to utter the inevitable disclaimers:

> The individual teacher will be able to reorganize the readings and the ideas suggested by them in his own most fertile order, while the student--no matter in what order he reads--will find himself submerged in and excited by that best of all intellectual experiences, the experience of the charm of great writers. (viii)

This seems to say that any order is satisfactory. These are all good essays. And a great many of them are splendid pieces of work. But my objection to the disclaimer here is the same as it was for Toward Liberal Education. Some organization in the presentation is part of teaching. Of course, every teacher may want to develop his own order. But editors should not bother to tell us that. They should tell us what their order is and why they settled on it. We can decide what parts of their method we want to keep and what to disregard. One often hears the old pedagogical cliché that "there are as many good ways of organizing materials as there are composition teachers." This is nonsense, of course. Some teachers are smarter than others, and, on some occasions, their superior intelligence is reflected in superior teaching methods. Good teachers, like Van Ghent and Maas, should not invite inferior teachers to tamper with their materials.

The Essential Prose offers an alternate arrangement of the contents of the book in its index "arranged by rhetorical forms and elements." Materials here are arranged under traditional headings--"Methods of Exposition," "Argument and Persuasion," "Description and Narration," "Informal Discourse," "Diction and Style," and evan "Research," the heading listing those essays which contain, in their exercise material, suggestions for short research papers. The rhetorical index is not suspect here, as it was in Toward Liberal Education because these editors announce as part of their goal the providing of materials for discursive writing. However, the fact that the primary table of contents is an arrangement of materials under subject headings suggests that the editors were really more concerned with the introduction to liberal education than with providing models exemplifying rhetorical strategies.

The purpose of the instructional apparatus accompanying the essays is "to explore both the substance of the piece and its rhetorical strategies." (vii) The editors promise generous sets of questions exploring the content and rhetorical strategies of the essays in the text. This they do. There is a nice balance of questions on both content and rhetorical strategies. Only occasionally, however, do they develop what seems to be a real plan for working through an essay. Obviously, they prefer questions which open up possible avenues of inquiry here and there, but they would strengthen their apparatus if they were to consistently give more attention to the order of their questions. For example, Their attention, not only to the substance but to the order of the questions, in the very first essay in the book produces a splendid lesson plan.

The essay is Maxim Gorky's "An End and a Beginning." The editors ask incisive questions about it, moving from the specific to the general so that the student gets an ever widening scope of understanding about the essay. If he answers the questions intelligently, he will experience a kind of progressive discovery of the layers of meaning in it. Let me illustrate. The first question limits itself to the first two paragraphs. It asks how interest is gained, and it suggests that the way in which certain details are presented may provide a clue to the answer. The student is asked to supply those details.

Question two invites the student to study the diction of the piece. He is asked how vividness is achieved. "For instance, is it by adjectives? verbs? nouns naming concrete things? a particular kind of diction or a particular kind of phrasing? similes? Pick out a few of the similes; how effective are they? why are they effective?" (16) This is a request for very specific analysis of an important aspect of writing--a writer's use of words.

Question three, building on the student's work with the first two paragraphs and diction next directs his attention to point of view, in the literary sense. Gorky's essay is in the first person. The editors invite the student to write the account or portions of it from the point of view of an impersonal narrator. The student is then asked what significant changes would be wrought by such a move. That is the kind of question which leads to discovery.

Question four builds upon three. The student, now aware of point of view, is asked about the rhetoric of it. "How is it that we are given the impressions of a young child, impressions that do not seem to be adulterated by any adult attitude, and yet the writing is clearly controlled by an adult intelligence." Such a question goes to the heart of method.

Question five works upon the study of point of view for yet one more question, this one a large one relating to the whole essay. "How does the point of view of the child prevent the subject-matter from suffering the distortion of brutality or the distortion of sentimentality?" (17)

The sixth question, the last one preceding a writing assignment, moves outside the essay to ask the broadest question yet, one involving both content and rhetoric. "Looking on the chapter from Gorky in terms of 'initiation' (an 'initiation' presumes a natural unity, for it implies a fairly profound change of state, as from ignorance to knowledge or from one stage of life to another), write a critical paragraph supporting the view that the piece does have a self-substantial unity or does not." (17)

The primary virtues in this particular set of questions are the expanding sense of meaning of the experience and the expanding sense of rhetorical purpose which the questions lead the student to discover. They provide the most meaningful kind of educational experience for him.

Throughout the exercise material in the book are other good questions testing students' assimilation of content, awareness of rhetorical techniques, and suggested theme assignments. Picking and choosing among all the material of an 1100 page book is a difficult task. However, besides the questions on Gorky's essay, I note here a few which impressed me. For example, among the questions on Joan of Arc's "I Have Nothing More to Say," one finds this solid and provocative question on content: "We are inclined to shrug off phenomena like Joan's visions and voices as 'purely psychological' (whatever that may mean). But even a mystical interpretation of those phenomena must, if it is intelligent, find for them a basis in Joan's character and the circumstances that formed her character; it must be just as 'psychological' as any other interpretation, for mystical experiences occur only in human psyches." (248) Not only does such a question invite serious thought about phenomena which students are likely to regard with skepticism, but it inevitably leads them to ask the more fundamental question about their reasons for being skeptical which, hopefully, may lead them to insights into the way in which their culture (used in the broadest anthropological sense) has oriented them to react to experience.

One of their more inspired questions welding insights about both content and rhetorical strategies occurs after T. E. Lawrence's "Desert Spring." "The desert holds all of this together, from the first paragraph to the last. How frequently is there reference to the spring weather and what it brings forth? The movements of Lawrence and the tribesmen are necessarily directed by the ruthless motives of war, and therefore always closely related to the infliction of death or the suffering of it. Define the relation between the desert spring that brings delight even to camels ('they were knee-deep in succulent greenstuff'), and the fatality of death with which these men must constantly consort." (272)

A good theme assignment occurs in the material following the last section after the sub-section "Attitudes Toward Death." "One of the chief horrors clinging to the idea of death is that it is meaningless and makes human life meaningless (this attitude toward death--constituting the real 'problem' of death--is as old as the Book of Job and is a major motif in the contemporary philosophical movement called Existentialism). Look back over the pieces in this section and write a short paper comparing the attitudes toward death shown in them, with the central idea in mind: how, in each, is death presented, not as meaningless, but as meaningful?" (360) This assignment is valuable because it requires the student to focus his energies on a single topic derived from his study of several essays. He must make the connections, the basic predications. Hopefully, he will gain new insights into the subject matter of the whole section, individual essays, and the way in which one establishes a purpose for a piece of writing and carries it out.

Many other exercises for writing, not so broad in scope as the one cited, are imaginative and useful. For example, relating Sherwood Anderson's "Discovery of a Father" and James Joyce's "A Sundering," the editors suggest the following writing exercise: "As a slight exercise in analysis of point of view, examine Joyce's third-person technique carefully, and then try rewriting the first paragraph of Anderson's "Discovery of a Father," using the third person instead of the first. (You can call the boy Sherwood.) Now try rewriting Joyce's first paragraph from the first-person point of view. What essential differences in effect do you discover?" (108) This exercise is not to be confused with the "write an essay in the style of X" type of assignment. It asks for student revision, using an altered point of view, of professional writers' work. As they discover how awkward and unsuccessful their efforts are, they will also be developing an appreciation for the literary abilities of the artists who made the original and successful decisions about the ways for adapting their methods to their subjects.

Not all the exercises in The Essential Prose are above criticism, however. For example, a suggested writing assignment on Addison's "Reflections in Westminster Abbey," "Visit some of the public monuments in your town and write your 'Reflections' upon them (sometimes the worst stimulate more reflection than the best)" is rather poor. It merely says, "Do what the author did." It is but one step removed from a most banal type of freshman composition exercise, the one requiring students to write an essay in the style of a particular writer whose work they have just read. It lacks a catalyst to trigger student thinking on the subject. A far better assignment would be to have students select that piece of architecture on campus to which they have the strongest reaction, of any kind--dislike, pleasure, disgust, awe, etc. Next, they should be instructed to describe, in detail, the associations (with places, people, events, experiences, etc.) which the piece of architecture evokes. More specific directions like these get the students' reflections operating much more effectively.

One other instance of noticeable drop in quality, noticeable because the quality of the exercise material is generally high throughout the book, occurs after Shaw's "She Would Have Enjoyed It." The question, "Pick out two or three sentences or phrases which seem to you vividly descriptive. Why are they?", comes dangerously close to being like my favorite question in Richard Armour's It All Started With Columbus: "Come to a conclusion."

Summing up, one would have to say that despite minor defects in the exercise material, The Essential Prose is an excellent book, in fact, one of the finest omnibus readers ever produced. It has excellent materials, its instructional apparatus, while it could be improved, is detailed and full of valuable teaching devices, and its organization, for the most part, is purposeful and intellegent and suited to carrying out the broad purposes of the book. Its drawback as a text for freshman composition classes is one of its virtues: the essays may be too difficult intellectually for all but outstanding freshmen. The book is a compendium of the work of great men and women: W. B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, Plutarch, Herodotus, Plato, Aristotle, Arnold Toynbee, Edward Gibbon, Edmund Wilson, Loren Eiseley, Pascal, Fred Hoyle, Sigmund Freud, Jung, Proust, Berkeley, Locke, Hume, Susanne Langer, Ruskin, Mill--the names are a Who's Who of great men and women in the history of western culture, both ancient and modern.

Above a picture of the Moses by Michelangelo, immediately after the table of contents, the editors have a quotation from T. S. Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent": "a perception not only of the pastness of the past. . ." It is taken from the following context: ". . . the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence; the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order. This historical sense, which is a sense of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and of the temporal together, is what makes a writer

Summing up, one would have to say that despite minor defects in the exercise material, The Essential Prose is an excellent book, in fact, one of the finest omnibus readers ever produced. It has excellent materials, its instructional apparatus, while it could be improved, is detailed and full of valuable teaching devices, and its organization, for the most part, is purposeful and intellegent and suited to carrying out the broad purposes of the book. Its drawback as a text for freshman composition classes is one of its virtues: the essays may be too difficult intellectually for all but outstanding freshmen. The book is a compendium of the work of great men and women: W. B. Yeats, T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, Plutarch, Herodotus, Plato, Aristotle, Arnold Toynbee, Edward Gibbon, Edmund Wilson, Loren Eiseley, Pascal, Fred Hoyle, Sigmund Freud, Jung, Proust, Berkeley, Locke, Hume, Susanne Langer, Ruskin, Mill--the names are a Who's Who of great men and women in the history of western culture, both ancient and modern.

Above a picture of the Moses by Michelangelo, immediately after the table of contents, the editors have a quotation from T. S. Eliot's "Tradition and the Individual Talent": "a perception not only of the pastness of the past. . ." It is taken from the following context: ". . . the historical sense involves a perception, not only of the pastness of the past, but of its presence; the historical sense compels a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of his own country has a simultaneous existence and composes a simultaneous order. This historical sense, which is a sense of the timeless as well as of the temporal and of the timeless and of the temporal together, is what makes a writer traditional. And it is at the same time what makes a writer most acutely conscious of his place in time of his own contemporaneity." Ultimately, it is the editors' best defense of the content which distinguishes their book.

> Muscatine, Charles, and Marlene Griffith. The Borzoi College Reader. New York, 1966. Alfred Knopf.

The Borzoi College Reader is the third of the large omnibus readers that I include in this study. It has been intensively promoted and widely adopted. And for understandable reasons. In its rationale, organization, contents, and instructional apparatus it is, for the most part, a very well-planned book.

The editors get down to serious business immediately in their preface. "To teach the art of critical thinking is the main design of this book." (xxi) This in turn, leads to the expression of a broader philosophical purpose:

> Critical thinking, reading, and writing are closely interwoven, but all three depend on a sensibility and a mind which are active, not passive. Although each individual will pick up the thread to his own self at a different place, all three can and ultimately do lead him back to a discovery of what he really is and lead him forward to a discovery of what he really wants, both personally and socially." (xxi)

A noble purpose, to be sure. Behind it, however, lies the assumption most pertinent to would-be writers: learn to analyze and to think critically and you will write well. That is an assumption about which I shall have more to say later in the paper.

The editors next proceed to explain the means by which they hope to implement their purposes. They point out that the material of the book is primarily expository prose and that they have arranged the essays in the text by subject matter. Actually, a number of tables of contents for this book have been devised, both by the editors and Professor Richard Larson who prepared a rhetorical guide for the text, but I will take these up in my discussion of the book's extensive rhetorical apparatus. Suffice it to say here that the editors conceived of the organization by topic as the basic plan of the book.

There are sixteen major sections in The Borzoi College Reader: (1) "The Necessity For Thinking"; (2) "The Right Use of Language"; (3) "What Is America"; (4) "The Individual and Society"; (5) "Crime and Punishment"; (6) "Civil Disobedience"; (7) "Censorship"; (8) "Privacy"; (9) "Social Implications of Race"; (10) "The Future of Religion"; (11) "The Responsibility of the Scientist"; (12) "Technology and Human Values"; (13) "Work and Leisure"; (14) "The Fate of the City"; (15) "The Function of Art"; (16) "On the Standards of Taste." In determining these topics, the editors used the following criterion: "From among many respectable topics we have tried to choose only those on which meaningful current debate is possible." (xxi) While I would not argue that meaningful current debate (depending upon what one means by "meaningful") is not possible on the topics they have chosen, I question the criterion itself. The implication is that meaningfulness derives more from the subject matter than the manner in which it is presented. I am prepared to argue that meaningful debate can occur on almost any topic depending upon the intelligence and purpose of the debaters and the context in which the debate is taking place.

Their rationale for the order of the sixteen major sections is only partially adequate. They defend the placement of the first two adequately, calling them "a preface and challenge to the whole business of reading and writing." They pose the basic questions, "what's the good, or what's the importance, of reading and writing? Why are we here?" (Teacher's Guide, viii) But their statement about the order of the following fourteen sections which "are arranged in groups that make good sense if studied in the order given" is not so satisfactory. In the preface the editors assert that these large sections are related to one another both in groups and sequences, but they do not amplify this remark to explain more precisely what they mean. It is possible, however, to view the sections on "The Individual and Society," "Crime and Punishment," and "Civil Disobedience" as belonging to a common heading, "The Individual in His Relation to Society," and to stretch a bit to see the connections between "Censorship" and Privacy." But the transitions from "Civil Disobedience" to "Censorship" and from "Privacy" to "Social Implications of Race" are not so clear. I am merely suggesting that the editors could be more explicit about these connections because they imply that they exist.

I suspect that beyond the placement of the first two sections the arrangement of the others was not a primary consideration of the editors. They have expressed much more concern with the relatedness of the materials in their text. "We have, thus, been able to collect under each topic pieces representing a variety of arguments, often in direct conflict with each other. The reading presents, then, a wide range of subjects, ideas, and assumptions, and at the same time a continuous dialogue or debate among them. . . .Suggesting comparison at every point, giving ready occasion to take sides and to criticize, the material is directly suited to generating discussion and writing." This it is. They offer a set of cross-references to essays in diverse sections of the book and explain their relatedness:

> He [the reader] may wish to read Susanne Langer's "The Lord of Creation" along with Paul Tillich's "Symbols of Faith" for their common interest in symbolism; John Kouwenhoven and Dan Jacobson together on physical aspects of the American scene; or John Stuart Mill and August Heckscher together for their common concern with distinguishing the private and the public spheres of life. Plentiful cross-connections such as these may help the beginning critical reader to appreciate the ultimate interrelatedness of important ideas and issues: to see, for instance, how ideas on language can affect religious thought, how notions of government can be related to topics in anthropology and psychology, how attitudes toward scientific research can influence our opportunities for work, our manner of living, and perhaps even our survival." (xxii)

A rationale for the arrangement of essays in individual sections is given more thought by the editors. In prefaces to seven of the sixteen major sections of the book are clear statements of a rationale for the order of the essays. Typical of the best of these rationales are the prefaces to the sections "The Right Use of Language" and "Crime and Punishment."

> We present Mrs. Langer's essay first [in "The Right Use of Language] for a number of reasons. While it touches only peripherally on language itself, it powerfully and clearly describes the mechanism in which language and thought are related--symbolism--and thus provides a link betweem this and the preceding section. Mrs. Langer's stress on man's unique capacity to manipulate symbols leads directly to a consideration of the political significance of the use of language, a subject taken up in detail by Orwell. (57)

Thus the placement of Mrs. Langer's essay fulfills three functions, all of them organizational, all of them important: (1) it is the link between two major sections: (2) it is a general statement of principles to be specifically dealt with in the section it heads: (3) it is followed by an essay which grows out of many of the considerations Mrs. Langer offers.

In the section, "Crime and Punishment," they offer four essays on what they call "the practical and moral issues which continue to be deabted," among which are the opposed positions of Jacques Barzun and H. L. Mencken. From this group of essays they proceed to a related and increasingly more preoccupying question about crime and punishment; the relationship of mental illness and criminal behavior. Opposing positions here, for example the essays by Karl Menninger and Thomas Szasz, are included. They conclude the section with a story by Tolstoy in which "the whole question of guilt, punishment, and moral rehabilitation is again raised, this time in pre-Freudian and fictional terms." (243) It becomes apparent that the materials of this section are arranged according to a consequential thought process. The editors assume that the reader will proceed from thinking about the merits of capital punishment to a consideration of its demerits to the nature of criminal behavior itself. This is a defensible rationale.

Despite this obvious purposefulness in the arrangement of essays in sections, there is ample evidence that the editors were more concerned with relationships between essays in a section. For example, in the section "The Responsibility of the Scientist," Louis Ridenour's "The Scientist Fights for Peace" is a direct response to Norbert Wiener's "A Scientist Rebels." If students should miss cross-relationships like these, the editors call them to their attention in general prefaces to groups of selections. For example, in the preface to the section, "The Fate of the City," the editors say:

> There has already been a great deal of strenuous

> and expensive coping with the successive problems of crowding, traffic, ugliness, noise, decay, and pollution as they have arisen in city after city, and there has been some "city planning" and some "urban renewal." The prospect, however, is profoundly unsatisfactory to some thinkers, chief among them Lewis Mumford, whose essay begins this section and whose views are specifically challenged by Robert Moses in the essay following. . . .Jane Jacobs in two essays presents an approach to city planning which Mumford calls sentimental but which merits the wide attention it has nevertheless received. (701)

Any student who misses these obvious invitations to comparative reading is simply not alert.

The editors explain their choice of materials, saying that "while the essays have thus been arranged for the play of their ideas, most of them have also been chosen as rhetorical models, with an eye to their usefulness as guides to the reader's own writing." (xxii, xxiii) That these are indeed their purposes is quite clear from the remarks I have quoted from their general preface, prefaces to sections, and purposeful arrangement of materials. The second purpose is also part of their pedagogical rationale for this book. I shall have more to say about it later.

The editors assert that the bulk of their selections are unabridged English essays, supplemented by a few translations of modern continental authors and some essays which have become classics. This is quite true. This is, for example, one of the few books of readings which prints the whole of Thoreau's "Civil Disobedience." And, of the 99 pieces I counted (excluding poems and short stories), 82 were twentieth century English (and American) essays, 17 pre-twentieth century, and 10 translations. The past is represented by Emerson, Newman, de Tocqueville, Dickens, Mill, Freud, Jefferson, Thoreau, Plato, and Swift, among others;

the present by Aldous Huxley, Susanne Langer, George Orwell, Denis Brogan, Jacques Barzun, H. L. Mencken, Albert Camus, Bertrand Russell, Ruth Benedict, James Baldwin, Paul Tillich, C. S. Lewis, Albert Einstein, Jacob Bronowski, Erich Fromm, Lewis Mumford, E. M. Forster, and Virginia Woolf, to name but a portion of the distinguished writers and thinkers, both English and non-English speaking, who are represented in these pages.

Unfortunately, editors Muscatine and Griffith also have the disclaimer impulse. Having given us ample and good reasons for choosing their materials and arranging them, they tell us, both in their preface and in the *Teacher's Guide,* that we may use the book as we please:

> The book is a big one and gives the reader plenty of choice, plenty of variety, and, of course, the option to read in whatever order he may find most stimulating. (xxi)
>
> Nothing, of course, prevents you from skipping around the book and rearranging its contents as you please. (*Teacher's Guide*, viii)

To the editors' credit, however, it must be said that they offer specific suggestions for reorganizing the material purposefully. For example, they suggest that the teacher of students in technical studies, engineering, for example, could, after completing the basic first two sections, proceed directly to "Technology and Human Values."

The instructional apparatus for *The Borzoi College Reader* is more extensive, I believe, than for any other reader on the market (excepting the obvious correlations between Sheridan Baker's books which I will take up later.) They offer a *Teacher's Guide* of some 158 pages, counting prefaces and indexes, prepared by editors Muscatine and Griffith, and a recently published *Rhetorical Guide*, prepared by Professor

Richard Larson of the University of Hawaii. The latter is 348 pages and is enough of a book in itself that I shall treat it separately from the Teacher's Guide.

Before turning to the Teacher's Guide, I would like to cite one more passage from the preface to the reader itself for the light it sheds on the editors' pedagogical theories:

> We have done much of our own teaching in a course whose readings are supposed to help the student "to follow critically the argument of a text, to perceive its structure, and to appreciate its style," and we teach that argument, structure, and style work together. But in both reading and composition we prefer to begin with argument, with the main idea, and to consider how structure and style help to express or support it. We believe that the expository essay that makes a point is the heart and soul of the course in composition, and we feel that the other rhetorical categories--description, narration, definition, comparison, and the like--had best be taught as adjuncts to the presentation of a well-buttressed main idea. (xxi)

For the sake of consistency, then, one could expect the editors to say in the Teacher's Guide, that their first purpose is to establish the principal idea of each essay they take up. However, they indicate that the questions they begin to ask about an essay first refer to organization, rhetoric, tone, and style. They do not take up ideas until they begin to develop a second stage in their sets of questions:

> Very roughly, the earliest numbered questions under each work are discussion questions referring to organization, rhetoric, tone, and style; the next are discussion questions on ideas, and the last are writing questions. (Teacher's Guide, ix)

It would seem more consistent with their pedagogical purposes to establish first the author's main idea and then follow with the other types of questions. As a matter of fact, the editors frequently offer questions about the basic purpose of an essay in their opening questions, but just as often they postpone discussion of purpose until the middle questions. Spot checking, I found the purpose sought or stated first in the questions on Robinson's "On Various Kinds of Thinking," Langer's "The Lord of Creation," and Weaver's "Ultimate Terms in Contemporary Rhetoric." The purpose is not sought in the opening questions on Golding's "Thinking As a Hobby," Newman's "On Liberal Knowledge," and Orwell's "Politics and the English Language."

The Teacher's Guide offers a variety of instructional aids: (1) a rhetorical index (argument and persuasion, assumptions, classification of materials, comparison and contrast, etc.--by no means as thorough or intended to be as Professor Larsons*) which is a mixture of rhetorical modes, forms of discourse, methods of development, and aspects; (2) a table of cross-references which indicates "titles of essays from other sections that might profitably be studied at the same time"; (3) a section called "Topics For Study" which contains questions on the individual essays, the questions arranged as previously noted.

Of most value in the Teacher's Guide is the section headed "Reading and Writing Assignments." In it the editors offer several concrete suggestions on the way in which the material of the book can be reorganized and used. They suggest, for example, how to use it in conjunction with a course in fiction.

Of less value are the questions themselves over various essays. Here is their rationale for the questions:

> The questions we offer are not divided into categories [they do not say specifically what they mean by "categories"] because we find that categories are rarely clear enough to be

> useful. Though we suggest discussion in some questions and the writing of essays in others, generally a good discussion question will make a good essay question, and vice versa. The ideal question of either kind sketches out the limits of a possible subject, but it neither tells the student what to think nor lets him get off comfortably without making a point himself. . . .Occasionally, one of our questions will indicate what we take to be the answer to a previous question, but this will do no harm if the questions are discussed in the order given. (Teacher's Guide, ix)

They seem to be trying to have their cake and eat it, too. They are saying that their questions are discussion questions, but some are not because they presuppose an answer. Investigation of the types of questions they actually ask reveals that some call for information and are designed primarily to test the care with which a student read an essay, some cover rhetorical strategies and problems, some deal with ideas, and some suggest writing assignments. A representative set of their questions, those for Jane Jacobs' "Violence in the City Streets," reveals the editors' methods.

The questions are preceded by an italicized statement which the editors customarily provide with each set of exercises: "This essay is stimulating for its unconventional ideas and lively marshaling of evidence in support of them." This is followed by question one: "What is the main idea of this essay, and what are the main kinds of evidence the author uses in support of her argument? Distinguish among statistics, expert testimony, evidence in the form of reported facts and incidents, and personal anecdote; consider the relative reliability and persuasiveness of each kind." The first part of the question is consistent with their stated purpose in offering certain kinds of selections: it presupposes an argument buttressed by proof and asks the students to identify it. However, they say that, usually, their earlier questions have a rhetorical thrust. This is one instance in which the very first question does not. It wants an answer about the essay. The last part of the first question has a rhetorical character, but it is partially answered in the second sentence of the question. Then they ask for a judgment on the evidence used. What comes out of the question is rhetoric, opinion, and purpose, all in one question. It seems a rather overpowering beginning.

Question two: "Examine the two incidents used as illustration in the paragraphs beginning 'It is just so elsewhere' (page 736). Then write an essay of your own in which you use a concrete incident to illustrate a point." This is too early in the questioning (according to their formula) for a question on writing, and the topic for the essay is too ill-defined. "Use a concrete incident to illustrate a point?" Students need more specific direction than this, some reference to a detail Mrs. Jacobs uses effectively.

Question three: "Mrs. Jacobs several times uses comparison or contrast to enforce her point. Identify all such uses in the essay. Write a brief essay contrasting two neighborhoods or two parts of the same street in your city. Try to make the contrast illustrate a point, even if it is one of Mrs. Jacobs." This is a better question than previous ones. It refers to a specific method of development and gives a more specific set of directions for writing than did the previous question.

Question four: "What are the positive valuse Mrs. Jacobs wants for city-dwellers? Write a brief essay describing her image of the city. Is it like yours?" The first part of the question might be placed, to greater advantage, in question one. The writing assignment, the weaker part of the question, suffers from ambiguity. "Image" should be clarified for students. Teachers of English would understand it; freshmen are something else again. This points to a problem of which teachers in any discipline must always be aware. They must remember that their educational and professional vocabularies may become so habitual to them that they forget just how much the uninitiated can be confused by them.

Question five: "How does Mrs. Jacobs' requirement of '*eyes* upon the street' (page 734) fit with the problems taken up by the essayists on 'Privacy' and by Mowrer and Ellul (pages 627 and 615)?" This is a good content question in that it relates this essay to the sections on "Privacy" and "Technology and Human Values." It also represents a fulfillment of the editors' pedagogical promise: to encourage the perception of relationships.

Question six: "Write an essay on enjoying the city streets. Is it a lost art in your city? Consider such streets Dan Jacobson describes in 'The Severed Tendon' above." Two goals are accomplished by this question. First, relationships are established between this essay and another in the same section, an important function of their questions; second the writing assignment is a most provocative one. It may awaken sleeping senses and cause some students to re-examine some of their habitual responses.

Questions seven, nine, and ten do the same kinds of things already cited: drawing of comparisons between essays in the section, provoking of thought about the character of other cities in our nation, etc. Question eight uses the familiar device of spinning theme assignments off specific quotations from Mrs. Jacobs' essay.

My general impression of their questions, derived from close study of exercises like those on the Jacobs' essay and others, is that the editors might do well to follow the order they indicate for their questions fairly rigorously. When they depart from this order, their questions become random darts, albeit good darts, shooting off on several tangents. Questions which work carefully toward exposing a point about an essay seem to me to be more successful. That is a matter of pedagogical opinion, however, and is not likely to be resolved to any teacher's satisfaction.

Larson's *Rhetorical Guide* intensifies the analytical character of the *Borzoi College Reader's* instructional apparatus. One cannot fault Professor Larson for/not doing his job thoroughly unless to say that perhaps he does it *too* thoroughly. What comes into question is the basic assumption upon which it rests: that intensive explication of rhetorical strategies in essays makes students better writers. The *Rhetorical Guide* has *four* tables of contents. The first is by topic, following the actual organization of the reader. The second is by rhetorical pattern, defined as "major rhetorical patterns or directions of movement within an essay. Larson identifies thirty such patterns, several of them sub-species within a species. For example,he offers four different types of definition (definition-identification-analysis of operations; definition-contrast and evaluation; definition--illustration of ways to correct a condition; definition to help resolve a question) and three types of generalization (generalization--analysis of cause and consequence--evaluation; generalization--example; generalization--examples of phenomena--analysis of operation--evaluation). The third table of contents, like the second, is an index which classifies parts of essays under eighty-two separate rhetorical procedures. Obviously, many essays are represented under a variety of these headings. The headings themselves refine rhetorical analysis as no other document I have seen does. There are five different "analysis" headings (analysis of causation, analysis of the causes of a problem, analysis of instruments used, analysis and evaluation of himself by the speaker, and analysis of statements of authority), five "contrast" headings, and eleven "evaluations." Of his eighty-two separate "rhetorical activities" Professor Larson says, "Many of them are not commonly recognized as separate procedures in current texts on rhetoric. The user of the Rhetorical Guide is invited to decide for himself whether it is worthwhile to isolate each of these procedures. If the index helps demonstrate the rhetorical complexity of each essay, its compilation will be justified, though it scarcely simplifies the task of a teacher who is organizing his composition course around rhetorical techniques." Precisely. Another more fundamental objection to this kind of classifying is that it defeats the process of abstraction itself. Any abstraction, definition, for example, to describe a method generally employed in writing an essay, oversimplifies because it is not the nature of an abstraction to take account of all the fine discriminations between objects in a group. If one pushes this practice of inventing more and more categories for types of essays or strategies within them to its logical conclusion, he may end up creating a separate category for every essay that has ever been written. The fourth table of contents classifies the essays according to style under such headings as the following: "balance, antithesis, or coordination conspicuous in the arrangement of thought and/or in design of sentences";

"categorical, positive emphatic structures, often short, sometimes aphoristic;' and "density of observed detail in individual sentences as well as successive sentences." Altogether there are ten such headings.

The author of the *Rhetorical Guide* sees its purpose as follows:

> The present *Rhetorical Guide* focuses primarily on the design, tone, and style of each essay, in the hope of showing that each is a complex, artful construct worthy of careful analysis. More important, the *Rhetorical Guide* assumes that each essay was written to be read by an audience, whether that audience was expected to be large and heterogeneous or small and selective. It assumes further that in addressing his audience the author of each essay sought to achieve a particular goal, and it asks how the writer's techniques served (or failed to serve) his purpose. (xii)

Professor Larson feels that anthologies organized by rhetorical categories have deficiencies which his book will correct: "They oversimplify the techniques and structure of the essays they list"; they fail to recognize ". . .many of the procedures actually employed by professional writers to achieve their purposes in addressing their audiences, such as direct appeals to the reader, various techniques for making value judgments, the use of paradox or inquiry as a way of beginning an essay"; and their questions ". . .do not lead to an understanding of how various features interrelate to help the essay produce its total effect." (x, xi) His book is to supply these deficiencies.

Part of the method he employs, his multiple classifications of the essays according to rhetorical patterns, rhetorical procedures, and style, I have already indicated. The fourth part of his apparatus consists of commentaries on the various essays: "Each commentary covers six points: the apparent audience for the essay; its purpose; its structure; the tone or tones heard in it; the dominant characteristics of style;

and questions that might stimulate discussion of the rhetoric of the essay." (xiv) He adheres rigorously to this pattern in the commentaries. He is to be praised, in fact, for delivering exactly what he promises. The commentaries are quite good, the questions intelligent and well designed to promote discussion of the rhetorical aspects of each essay. Used in conjunction with the Teacher's Guide, it provides a tool for analyzing just about every aspect of an essay a teacher would ever want to cover.

The Borzoi College Reader is a strong book both for the quality of its selections but more for the elaborateness of its teaching apparatus. That alone is half again as long as the book. However, its selections, while good, are not quite as good as those of Toward Liberal Education and considerably less difficult intellectually than those in The Essential Prose. But I am describing degrees of quality, not degrees of inferiority. The Borzoi's instructional apparatus is impressive and much more thorough than that offered by the other two books; whether it is consistently superior to that of The Essential Prose is questionable. Of course, Professor Larson's Rhetorical Guide gives it a dimension neither of the other books possesses. I reserve my observation on the book's fundamental assumption, that critical thinking leads to good writing, until later in the paper. That this assumption is vulnerable, however, I feel strongly. If it is, then the rationale on which the Borzoi Reader and its entire apparatus rests may be called into question.

Clayes, Stanley A. and David G. Spencer. Contexts for Composition. New York, 1965. Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Contexts for Composition is the first of two widely adopted "rhetoric" readers I shall analyze closely in this report. The editors tell us that it will combine the functions of a rhetoric and a reader by supplying both theory and example in the same work:

> ¶ CONTEXTS FOR COMPOSITION is designed as an anthology that requires no separate rhetoric text. Not only do the selections themselves exemplify aspects of rhetoric, but many of them also examine principles of rhetoric deliberately and in detail: for example, the essays by Hayakawa, Altick, Robert G. Davis, Orwell, Barzun, and Ciardi. (v)

The book consists of three major sections and thirteen sub-sections: I. Methods of Exposition--A. "Defining," B. "Discriminating," C. "Classifying," D."Assigning Causes"; II. Style--A. "Words and Tone," B. "The Triumph of Language," C. "Some Devices of Style," D. "Concreteness and Symbol," E. "Illustration and Naturalness"; III. Arguments--A. "Language and Correctness," B. "The American Scene," C. "Education in America," D. "Society and the Individual."[6] The editors say nothing at all about the order of the major sections or the sub-sections within them. They preface only six of the thirteen sub-sections and in these say little about the order of the essays. When they do mention individual essays, they usually do so only to explain . particular essay's relevance to the sub-section in which it is placed.

I have raised this question of the order of materials in discussing previous books because, as I have already pointed out, the order in which a teacher presents his materials reveals important assumptions about his pedagogical methods. Now, there are several important questions to be raised about the order of materials in this text. First, why do the editors work from methods of exposition through style to argument? I think this an organization scheme which could be defended, but I would like to have a statement, for example, to the effect that students master the processes of composition if they are presented in this sequence, hence this arrangement. Second, what principle governs the sequence of sub-sections and the order of essays in them? Why, for example, is "Defining" ahead of "Discriminating" and both of these prior to "Classifying"? Is relevance to a common topic the only thing which unifies essays in a section? For example, "Language and Correctness" has a group of essays on the nature and function of dictionaries. Wilson Follett's vitriolic attack on Webster's Third International Dictionary opens the section, Bergen Evans' defense of it follows, Mario Pei's reasoned and sober attack on the work comes next, James Sledd's equally reasoned and sober defense of it follows, and Samuel Johnson's great"Preface to A Dictionary of the English Language" concludes the section. I suppose the alternating pattern,of arguments is reasonable, but why was it chosen in preference, say, to lumping all the arguments supporting the dictionary and then all those attacking it? For most of the sections, the chronological order in which they were written is not a factor in their placement, but the last sub-section of the book does employ this technique. Aristotle, Spinoza, and Mill, in that order, precede the moderns.

A clearer rationale is offered explaining the choice of materials for the text:

> Most anthologies for composition include works that are, hopefully, as good for their purpose as they are new to the eyes of instructors. This collection presents models for analysis and discussion which, though excellent in our own experience for this purpose, make no large claim to novelty. In garnering the "best," we have tried to judge the quality as well as the quantity of student responses throughout our classes in recent years not only to specific selections but also to general topics. Apart from their known value in eliciting student thought and comment, these selections link at many points with one another. (v)

This rationale suggests two criteria for the choice of essays, one of which may not have been intended by the editors. First, we are told that the essays are, hopefully, the best prose models. The "best" means, if I read their statement correctly, those essays which have provoked the most and the best responses from students. Perhaps they mean, instead of best, "most teachable." Like many teachers of English, I can think of many excellent essays, Emerson's "The American Scholar," for example, which induce sleep more than they provoke discussion. Yet, it is an excellent essay. The students are simply not qualified to judge. Their second criterion, that the essays interrelate, is a good one.

The editors clearly prefer contemporary materials. Of the sixty-one selections here, only eleven were written before the twentieth century. Of the eleven, only seven are in prose. By contrast, The Essential Prose has thirty-four of ninety-three pieces from the past.

Clayes and Spencer, like their predecessors in this report, cannot refrain from the disclaimer:

> At what point to begin building a text on the process of composition--and analogously at what point to begin organizing a course on it--varies, of course, with the imagination and ability of the instructor as well as his tastes and opinions. We have attempted to make our choices ample and their articulation flexible in the hope that, while Contexts for Composition retains integrity and coherence, the preferences and judgments of many colleagues can be met. (v)

This disclaimer is particularly feeble coming from a book which is designed to be a course. We need a defense of the course presented, not the same old line that anyone can make his own course with it.

Essentially, the instructional apparatus consists of prefaces to six sub-sections ("Defining," "Discriminating," "Classifying," Assigning Causes," "Language and Correctness," and "The American Scene") and sets of questions after most of the essays in the book. The editors explain their purposes in preparing this apparatus:

> Where necessary, the introductions to each section provide essential distinctions that any reader and writer should master at the very outset. Questions follow almost every selection; initially they focus on language and rhetorical principles and toward the end shift to the selection's subject matter and the student's own experience and outlook. One or more topics which suggest themes for writing from the selection's discourse and within the student's grasp conclude most reading assignments. (v)

The prefatory essays to the sub-sections are, though brief, intelligent and helpful. They do not burden the student with technical and irrelevant information. For example, the first sentence in "Techniques For Definition," "Definition is a method of analysis, as logical as possible, in which the subject is located in a general class and then distinguished from all other members of that class," is laudable for its clarity and succinctness. The editors then offer eight methods of defining, all explained with equal clarity and brevity: (1)"assigning the term to a genus or class";(2)"comparing and contrasting";(3)"use of analogy"; (4)"use of familiar examples";(5)"use of historical meanings";(6)"defining negatively";(7)"enumerating essential characteristics";and (8)"isolating one essential characteristic." (3,4)

In the discussion of issues which can be argued, the editors offer these observations: "Argument usually focuses on which of two courses of action to take, or on whether a certain action or decision was good or bad. Intelligent people do not argue about how much aid the United States provided to South America last year. A little research uncovers the answer. But whether we should provide more or less aid this year, or whether we provided to little or too much last year, are questions for argument." (293) Generalizations like the one stated here, supported by clear examples, are the strength of the instructional apparatus in the book. But when one turns to questions for the analysis of individual essays and suggestions for theme topics, he is likely to be less satisfied. Their quality is most uneven. Some are bad, little more than a gagging at gnats about content, bits and pieces of rhetorical strategy; and they are often tied to a paragraph by paragraph consideration of an essay. Others are quite good, broad synthesizing questions about the essays which require significant intellectual effort on the part of students. Let me illustrate. The questions on the Kennedy Inaugural Address are among the book's worst for narrowness of purpose and limitedness of scope:

> 1. Comment upon the transition between paragraphs 1 and 2.
> 2. Why is the first sentence of paragraph 3 both a transitional and a topic sentence?
> 3. What repetition connects paragraphs 3 through 9?
> 4. Is paragraph 4 a periodic sentence?
> 5. What is the stylistic effect of the dash in paragraph 5?
> 6. In the last sentence of paragraph 6 what two allusions can you identify?
> 7. What is the meaning of paragraph 7? Describe a situation to which it applies. How is the allusion to riding the tiger appropriate?
> 8. Describe the sentence structure of paragraph 8. What is the meaning and logic of the last sentence?
> 9. Comment in paragraphs 8 and 9 upon the parallelism and the repetition of sounds and structure and words.
> 10. Find the metaphors and other figures of speech in the following paragraphs: 11, 12, 19, 22, 24.
> 11. Find as many examples of triads as you can throughout the speech. (258)

Question 1 is inane. It does not open the way to a discussion of the speech's basic ideas; it fails to begin to develop significant discussion of its fundamental rhetorical strategies. I can think of few worse questions than this one to open discussion of an essay. It begins with trivia and, unfortunately, sets the tone for the rest of the questions. Questions 2 and 3 improve somewhat, but 4, 5, and 6 are first cousins to 1. Questions 10 and 11 are little better. The whole set fails to develop any significant rhetorical or intellectual generalizations about the address.

When one turns to the questions at the end of the section on "Style," he finds it difficult to believe that they come from the same text that contained the questions just cited. The references are to four essays: Orwell's "Politics and the English Language," Samuel Williamson's "How To Write Like a Social Scientist," William Whyte's "You, Too, Can Write the Casual Style," and Jacques Barzun's "How To Write and Be Read."

1. Compare and contrast the rules for good writing (Orwell) and the rules for writing like a social scientist (Williamson).
2. Draw up a list of twenty-five examples, none of which is listed by any of the four writers here, of dying metaphors, operators (or false verbal false limbs), pretentious diction, meaningless words. Quote and cite, if possible, a source in which you have found each used.
3. Orwell asserts, "In our time it is broadly true that political writing is bad writing." Choose from the files of The New York Times or elsewhere, the text of two or more political speeches delivered by candidates for high political office in a state or national election. Analyze them from the point of view of the categories established by Orwell.
4. Take any issue of the New Yorker and analyze the sections entitled "The Talk of the Town" and "The Current Cinema" as well as that issue's short story from the point of view of the twelve devices of casual stylists listed by Whyte.

> 5. On the basis of inferences from evidence you find only in the four essays themselves, discuss the probable backgrounds of each of the authors, the audiences to which they seem to be speaking and the effectiveness with which each uses evidence and direct quotation to support his criticisms. Which one (or ones), in discussing the prevalence of stale imagery, imprecision and pretentiousness in contemporary writing, is the most vivid, precise, direct? Document your choice. (205,206)

In their drawing together of ideas about style, rhetoric, and subject matter in the four essays; in their challenge to the student to apply what he has learned to the material from which he has learned it; and in their stress, in question 5, on writing as an act of communication in a social context, these questions have great merit.

Theme topics, like these representative sets of questions, range from the inane to the excellent. For example, after David Daiches' "Education in a Democratic Society," we find: "Compare and contrast methods of education you have observed in high school and college." (89) The topic practically guarantees bad writing because it requires more limiting and defining than most students will be able to do.[7] Here is another bad topic: "Write an essay in which you define one of the following terms: love, honor, security, conformity, humility." (38) Defining abstractions is a perfectly acceptable exercise. However, to prevent the themes it generates from becoming deadly, because most students will remain on the same level of abstraction as the word, it is imperative that the assignment add the following stipulation: define the abstraction in terms of a place, person, incident, etc.[8] The suggestion of concreteness may save the assignment.

A much better topic for writing is question 5 cited above from the section on "Style." It specificies the body of evidence students are to work through and tells them the kinds of questions they are to ask about it. Their job becomes one of sifting evidence, developing generalizations, and supporting them. And the assignment is relevant to the section out of which it grows.

Summing up, I would say these things of Contexts For Composition: (1) its rationale is commendable, but its contents and instructional apparatus are, when the whole book is considered, mediocre; (2) the essays, although many good writers' work is represented here, are not consistently of the caliber of those in Toward Liberal Education, The Essential Prose, or the Borzoi College Reader; (3) the prefatory essays to various sections of the book are the most consistently good feature in it.

Baker, Sheridan. The Essayist. New York, 1963. Thomas Crowell.

The Essayist is a small book, thirty-nine selections of which fifteen are excerpts, in some 260 pages. It is, of course, not intended to be a competitor to the large omnibus readers. It is a rhetoric reader, but in a very special sense. It expounds Baker's rhetoric, and it does this very well:

> These essays take the student progressively through the questions of expository writing. They illustrate how a thesis may organize his points at a stroke, how a structure is built, how the paragraph, the sentence, and the word may work their various wiles. (ix)

This rationale cannot be fully understood apart from Baker's rhetoric, The Complete Stylist (or The Practical Stylist, an earlier and abbreviated version of The Complete Stylist) which spells out with admirable vigor and clarity Baker's conception of how a theme gets put together and consequently, how best to teach students to master the process:

> I emphasize argument as the quickest and clearest teacher of rhetorical principles. I begin at the big end of the compositional problem, thus reversing the order traditional with many handbooks, that of beginning with simple units and gradually building upward toward the "whole essay." This process I have always found too slow--indeed wasteful in its postponement of the whole essay's two most essential rhetorical principles, those of outer form and inner idea, of structure and thesis. Once the student has grasped the communicative and clarifying powers in structure and thesis, he can proceed easily to the smaller and smaller units, which get more powerful as they decrease in size--to paragraphs, to sentences, and to words, those conceptual wonders where our meanings begin and end. (Preface to The Complete Stylist, vii)

A comparison of the table of contents of The Complete Stylist and The Essayist shows how closely the latter derives from the former. Baker has chosen a set of readings to illustrate the generalizations he wishes to make about the composition process in the order he thinks most efficient to present them. The headings in The Essayist are the same as those in The Complete Stylist. And they show in sections 1-7, the movement, from the larger units of composition to smaller units, just as Baker promises. The titles of the eleven sections of the reader are as follows: (1) "Thesis; The Argumentative Edge"; (2) "Structure: Middle Tactics"; (3) "Middle Tactics: The Vector of Interest"; (4) "Paragraphs: Beginnings, Ends, & the Whole Essay"; (5) "Sentences: A Notebook of Styles"; (6) "Sentences in Exposition"; (7) "Words"; (8) "The Autobiographical Essay"; (9) "The Horrors of Exposition"; (10) "The Ironic Essay"; and (11) "Evidence and The Author's Voice." The last four sections deal with specific rhetorical problems generated by the ironic and autobiographical essay, unnecessarily difficult language, and point of view in an essay.

One has to be impressed by the rigor with which Baker pursues his rationale. His is a book of essays which are to be studied so that one may learn to write. He includes excerpts as well as complete essays to illustrate such things as sound opening or closing paragraphs. While the selections are from established and skillful writers--Virginia Woolf, George Orwell, Carl Becker, Stephen Leacock, E. B. White, Cyril Connolly among the moderns, and Jonathan Swift, Henry Thoreau, and Francis Bacon from the past--Baker keeps the reader reminded by his prefaces, which are rhetorically oriented, that his purpose is first of all to illustrate his generalizations about writing. For example, in the introductory essay to chapter three, "Middle Tactics: The Vector of Interest," Baker subordinates the purpose of supplying students with a liberal education, a justifiable purpose considering the contents--W. T. Stace's "Man Against Darkness; Rufus Jones' "The Mystic's Experience of God," and Thomas Macaulay's "Plato and Bacon"--and sticks closely to the business at hand:

> An essay's beginning and its end are important, since they set the thesis and round it to conclusion. We shall look at beginnings and ends closely in the next chapter, when we consider the different kinds of paragraphs. But the middle, the bulk of the essay, requires tactics that may differ considerably from the pro's and con's we have already seen. The three essays in this section will illustrate some of the differences. Their theses lie deeper than controversy; the opposition is only a shadowy bystander, with little of the structural force to be seen in Follett and Evans [reference to "Sabotage in Springfield" and "But What's A Dictionary For?"] But the essays will also show that one tactical principle underlies any effective structural order a writer can think of: to keep the reader interested, save the best for the last.
>
> Since the reader sees more clearly at each step into the essay, his interest naturally declines. The writer must therefore push upward to keep the vector of the reader's interest at least on the horizontal, with no sag and preferably with an upward swing. (53)

Baker's colorful and concrete language, his metaphorical transferring of abstract ideas about composition into concrete diagrams, are one of the book's strengths. The language here is partly derived from mathematics, partly from military terminology. It is fresh and it makes its points well. The strength of this particular preface, of course, goes far beyond its language. It reminds the student of rhetorical strategies he has studied, tells him of matters to be considered in the future, and then identifies the particular aspect of theme writing he is to take up. This constant, clear, identifying of the stages of learning and their relationships to one another is yet another attribute of *The Essayist*.

Baker's general remarks about the essays included in the book reveal his commitment to liberal education despite the fact that his book is not organized with a view to offering it. His concern is, first of all, with composition, mastering the steps in putting an essay together. But the humanist is present, too:

> You will notice that the essays tend to be concerned with books, to be written by men and women who have loved books. "You can never be wise unless you love reading," said Dr. Johnson; and he might have added "nor can you learn to write well." The first and last essays, indeed, show how marvelously the literate mind can respond to thought and experience. I include a number of classics of the classroom (my debt to previous anthologists is perhaps all too evident) partly because they have taught well, but mostly because they are valuable. The thoughts of a Thoreau, for example, or a Schweitzer, go deep enough for a lifetime. Like White, I believe that every student in the universe should know Thoreau; he once gave me a permanent turn, too, and I think I have learned more about writing from him than from anyone. (ix, x)

And his selections *are* often about books: Virginia Woolf's "How Should One Read a Book?", the Evans and Follett discussions of the Webster

Third International Dictionary, Bacon's "Of Studies." A minor but interesting point about his discussion of content is his admission of borrowing from other anthologists. Few editors are so candid.

He goes on to explain still further his rationale for including certain writers and essays in the book:

> In an age that preaches a keeping up with the linguistic Joneses, the student needs help from outside. He will learn nothing from the herd but to go along; he needs to see the virtues in other voices and other times. By worrying over the gristle in a Thoreau, he may perhaps discover how to give today's very different idiom an occasional blessing of fiber and fire. Consequently, I have sought a wide variety of excellence in the readings, and urged exercises imitating complex styles. And though I have tried to stick to the rhetorical point, I have nevertheless also sought a certain clash of idea and subject, from essay to essay, to stir up the sediment of language and idea both, and to leave the student something to sift for his own essay of the week. (x)

The best examples of contesting points of view are, of course, the Evans and Follett essays on the dictionary and the Stace and Jones essays offering radically different orientations toward religious experience. In recent editions he might have included his own involvement in a lively controversy over the status of "ain't."[9]

Baker's instructional apparatus is as purposeful as are the rationale, organization, and content of his book:

> Although I make frequent suggestions for reading the selections, everything is steadily kept to the one practical point: how to write an essay. Each of the eleven sections takes up a rhetorical problem and holds to it until the end, forgoing for the moment other targets of opportunity. To keep the aim sharp, I show the student in a general way what to look for as he begins each section; and at the end, instead of the usual "questions for study," I suggest ways for applying his own writing the principles he has just seen demonstrated. (ix)

And he is as good as his word. For example, the preface to chapter seven, "Words," is Baker at his best, fulfilling the promises of his preface and doing it in lively, colorful language which captures the imagination. Few textbook writers venture to so flambuoyantly practice what they preach while they are preaching it:

> Thoreau, the sentence-smith, knew what every good writer knows: that words are like seeds, common and unnoticed, just waiting to be waked up. Thoreau knew how to pun, to turn our common abstractions back into their original metaphors. In his opening passage, playing with the idea of buying a farm, playing with the fact that one can possess a thing only in one's consciousness and imagination, we find the imaginative punster at work. Season takes on a strong agricultural climate; survey means both to look over (its basic meaning inherited from Latin) and to measure for building; price means a cost not only financial but spiritual. The dynamics in deed you may trace for yourself. Go through Thoreau thoroughly, with a pencil sharpened for a pun. No other writer can teach you so well the figurative potency in common words, and the way to release it with a play of mind and language that is, indeed, a kind of inspired punning. (148)

In effect, students are told to forget, for the time being, the philosophical and cultural aspects of Walden; they are important to any student of literature, but Baker wants to make a point about the use of words at this stage in the writing process, and, as he says, he wants to "keep the aim sharp."

Having analyzed some aspects of metaphor, for example Thoreau's fresh use of an old metaphor--"I feel the spur of the moment thrust deep into my side"--Baker asks students to try the experiment of awakening a sleeping metaphor. "Try something like 'The apple of Jones's eye seemed a little overripe," or "And there she planted her feet: you could almost see them take root." (171)

The strength of this kind of exercise is its stress on the synthesizing aspect of writing. Baker is not content with analysis of someone else's work and the usual topic that follows. He wants students to experiment with techniques they have detected, and he has practical exercises which help them to make the effort of producing, in this case, an awakening of a dead metaphor.

Another good exercise in this section is his explanation of metaphor and directions for student use of it:

> To familiarize yourself with figurative writing, take several of Thoreau's figures of speech and analyze each one according to the three principal levels of figurative subtlety: the simile, the metaphor, the implied metaphor. The *simile* makes its figurative comparison openly, using *like*, *as*, or *as if*:
>
> She was like a cow.
> She walked as a cow walks.
> She chewed as if she were some thoughtful cow.
>
> The *metaphor* exaggerates further by pretending that "She *is* a cow." (In other words, drop the *like* from a simile and you have a metaphor.) The *implied metaphor* hints at the pretended identity without naming it, implying "cow" by using only a cowlike attribute or two: "She chewed her cud thoughtfully."
>
> Now, pick up one of your selections from Thoreau's figures of speech, put it in whichever of the three levels it belongs to, and fill in the other two levels, rephrasing the figure to suit them. (171, 172)

Here again Baker offers an exercise involving the student in the writing process, in playing with words the way a writer does. This technique is characteristic of Baker's instructional apparatus.

The Essayist has one specimen of extremely atrocious writing. The title of the essay is "An Experimental Investigation of Young Children's Interest and Expressive Behavior Responses to Single Statement, Verbal Repetition, and Ideational Repetition of Content in Animal Stories." Baker's exercise material, true to form, directs, analyzes, and then assists the student at making his own effort:

> Rewrite the title and first three paragraphs of the first selection, eliminating unnecessary words and pointless distinctions. What is the difference, for instance, between *experimental investigation* and an experiment? Does the writer need to distinguish between *interest* and *responses* (does

> she really do so in the experiment)? What is the difference between *content in animal stories* and *animal stories*? Underline every *of* in the passage, and then try to eliminate as many as possible by rephrasing. Eliminate the passive voice (notice the omnipresent *used*) by substituting *I*. For example, change "the subjects used in the establishing of" to "I established." (196)

Baker's theme topics are generally good because he takes the time and trouble to develop them. He chooses material students can write about, gives them an example of the kind of thing they might do, and occasionally offers advice about how to avoid the pitfalls of certain kinds of writing. One of his better topics is the one offered following Swift's "A Modest Proposal," which is his example, obviously, of the ironic essay:

> Write an ironic essay, with Swift your model. It need not be profound. Take some notorious collegiate fact or trait, and write, for instance, "A Modest Proposal to Encourage Recreation on Weekends." Imagine yourself a myopic do-gooder, and write an earnest, and modest, appeal to pry the students away from the books. Build your essay, as Swift does, on a regular argumentative structure with beginning, middle, and end. Your thesis will be irnoic, of course; but develop it as you would any argumentative thesis, using one of the *pro-con* structures on pages 48-49. Since irony depends on a shared understanding between writer and reader, you must pick some topic of common knowledge--or your irony will not be understood, and you will be talking in riddles. Since to write ironically you must be personally concerned, the world-shaking issues will probably be a little too impersonal for effective irony. And so again, pick something perfectly familiar, even playful and trivial, something like blind dates, roommates, dormitory food, eight o'clock classes, teased coiffures and blue eyelids, cluttering the walks with parked bicycles, or cluttering the lanes with parked cars. (208)

The Essayist is a closely unified group of selections to illustrate a method of teaching composition. The essays, the teaching apparatus, and the purposeful arrangement of the selections explicitly present Baker's method. If one wants not liberal education but a promising method of teaching composition, he will find this book, supplemented by The Complete Stylist (although it is not absolutely necessary) a very useful tool in class. It is by far, the most purposefully and regorously worked out reader examined thus far. Of the two rhetoric readers, it accomplishes its objectives much more effectively than Clayes and Spencer's Contexts For Composition. One cannot fault Baker for not delivering on the promises of his preface. One could disagree with him on whether or not his was the most effective method of teaching composition. However, the number of adoptions of this book and the rhetoric to which it is so closely bound suggest that there are many teachers of composition who find Baker's method successful. The most refreshing part of his book is its lack of disclaimers. The tone is his remarks throughout is "This is my method. Try it." He does not invite rearrangement of his materials to suit one's own conception of what a composition course should be, and I choose to think the absence of this disclaimer is purposeful. Baker does not want others tinkering with his materials. Rearranged, they would lose the force and vitality his method has imparted to them.

Kreuzer, James R. and Lee Cogan: Literature For Composition.
New York, 1965. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

There are not many books on the market like this one for reasons I shall discuss later. However, those that do exist, like Literature For Composition, are predicated upon some assumptions dear to the heart of many English teachers:

> This book is designed to give the instructor materials from which to teach composition. It differs from other collections of readings for composition in that the selections are all literary--short stories, poems, biographies, excerpts from novels, and belletristic essays. The materials are those that the instructor is professionally best equipped to teach and those that he, no doubt, most prefers to teach. (v)

I would not challenge tha assumption that most teachers of composition would prefer to teach belle-lettres in their writing courses. However, the implicit assumption that the teacher of English is prepared to use this material to teach students to write well is quite another predication. I am not raising the well-treaded objection that belle-lettres is not suitable for the teaching of expository or argumentative writing. My objection is much more fundamental. I question the ability of anyone whose professional training is primarily in the analysis of literature to teach someone else to compose a piece of writing. This is a question to which I will return in a later section of this report.

At any rate, the editors' purposes are clear. To implement them, they offer "short stories, poems, biographies, excerpts from novels, and belletristic essays. . . a wide range of writing from several centuries and from several countries." (v) From the past come the works of Shakespeare, Milton, Bacon, Arnold, Boswell, Carlyle, Dickens, Hardy, Hawthorne, Hazlitt, Samuel Johnson, Keats, James, Newman, and others. The twentieth century is represented by T. S. Eliot, Joyce, Lawrence, Woolf, Aldous Huxley, and Hemingway. Among the famous titles represented are "The Cask of Amontillado," Vanity Fair, The Life of Samuel Johnson, Madame Bovary, Pride and Prejudice, Remembrance of Things Past, Moby Dick, The Idea of a University, Romeo and Juliet, "Ulysses (Tennyson)," and Gulliver's Travels. The non-English or American writers are predominately French: Anatole France, Flaubert, Proust, Voltaire, and Baudelaire. Only two others (Nabokov excluded) are distinctly non-English: Isak Dinesen and Theodore Storm.

The book is divided into two major sections, but only the first has a purposeful arrangement of materials related to the study of composition techniques:

> The order of the selections in Part I has been determined by the rhetorical principles that can be taught through each selection: selections with apparatuses focusing on problems of writing the whole theme are followed by those dealing with paragraphing, sentence structure, and diction. In Part II, the selections provide the student with opportunities for applying all that he has learned from the rest of the book. No rhetorical principles are listed before the apparatuses for these selections, but various principles are dealt with, explicitly or implicitly. (vi)

Examination of the various sections reveal the organization they promise. Evidently, like Baker, they feel it is sounder practice to begin with the large units of a composition and proceed to smaller ones. For example, we find, in the first essays in the book, "Unity","Organization of the Whole","Limiting a Topic","Guiding Purpose,"and"Order" among the rhetorical matters under consideration. But there is a serious flaw, in their apparatus, I believe, and it first appears in their disclaimer:

> It is assumed that the instructor will not choose to teach all the selections in the book or to follow rigidly the order of the selections. Each apparatus, there, is independent of any other. The same rhetorical principle appears (and is independently treated) in more than one apparatus; it may receive major treatment in more than one apparatus and subsidiary treatment in others. (v,vi)

This is exactly what happens,and it is a fault, not a virtue, of this book. For example, this succession of rhetorical considerations occurs in the section of the book dealing with the whole theme. The italicized items are the principal considerations under any one heading, the others secondary considerations for a given essay. The numbering is mine:

1. *Unity*, Irony.
2. *Organization of the Whole*, Beginning and Ending.
3. *Limiting a Topic*, Order, Metaphor.
4. *Limiting a Topic*, Paragraph Structure and Development, Unity, Order.

5. *Organization*: *Comparison and Contrast*, Levels of Meaning, Tone.
6. *Unity*, *Guiding Purpose*, Coherence, Relevance.
7. *Guiding Purpose*, Order, Beginning and Ending, Proportion, Relevance, Comparison and Contrast.
8. *Significant Detail*: *Selectivity*, *Order*, Beginning and Ending, Unity.

And so it goes. Now, because of the disclaimer, one cannot fault these editors for not providing what they regard as a meaningful order in their presentation of ideas about composition. Their basic conception can be faulted, however. Even if others will use various portions of the book and perhaps not all, the editors could still commit themselves to a less duplicatious plan for presentating a composition program. This is the virtue of Baker's book. He has a menaingful progression of items. And, in his words, "To keep the aim sharp," he does not try to introduce several composition techniques at once. This Kreuzer and Cogan do. Ultimately, the problem is basically a pedagogical one. Is unlimited flexibility better than order and purpose?

Obviously conscious of possible diffusion of focus and energy on composition problems, the editors, besides italicizing the major rhetorical topics of each section, reinforce this plan by capitalizing their principle rhetorical concern or concerns at the beginning of each rhetorical apparatus. As a further aid to teachers, and a genuinely useful one it is, they provide, at the end of the book, an "Index of Rhetorical Principles" with reference to the essays which take up various specific problems. This would be especially helpful to the teacher making up his own course and imposing his order on their materials. Also commendable are the indexes by genre, ~~and~~ author, and title.

In the editors' defense it may be said that the exercises, the individual questions, at least are keyed to the type of compositional unit they have under study. The paragraph unit has questions primarily about paragraphs, the sentence unit questions about sentences, etc. For example, the section on Aldous Huxley's "Doodles in a Dictionary" is very good. It is cited as an example of unity, guiding purpose in an essay. The introduction to the questions and the questions themselves immediately address themselves to this problem:

> This essay by Aldous Huxley's seems at first reading to be "about" many things. At least we learn about many things in it: art, literature, lexicography, education, Henri de Toulouse Lautrec, Huxley himself. It seems, indeed, to ramble all over the lot and not to be "about" anything.
>
> And yet we have established that good writing--and certainly any work of literature--is unified, that is, has a central or guiding purpose.
>
> 1. In one sentence for each, state what we do learn from the essay about
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | art | education |
> | literature | Henri de Toulouse Lautrec |
> | lexicography | Aldous Huxley |
>
> 2. Which, if any, of these statements is the central theme of the entire essay? On what evidence do you base your answer?
>
> 3. If you choose one of your sentences as the theme, show how the other sentences are relevant to that theme. (56)

And so it goes. This is analysis with a discernible and intelligent purpose.

The opening questions on Auden's "In Memory of W. B. Yeats" are also good. The editors here are dealing with "Succinctness, Compression, and Figurative Language," primarily, and "Coherence and Order" secondarily:

> 1. Formulate as specifically as you can the content to which each of the three sections of the poem is devoted. Does the title do justice to the total content of

the poem? Why or why not? Comment on the appropriateness of the title.
2. Note the differences in line lengths and movement among the three sections of the poem. Show why you feel the differences are appropriate or inappropriate to the content.
3. Analyze the organization of the poem as a whole, indicating what factors you believe determined the order of the parts. Explain why you do or do not think the parts could have been differently ordered. (248)

The instructional apparatus of this book has its faults, however, many of which are exemplified in the set of questions over Dickens' "Night Walks." Their major rhetorical topic is "Limiting a Topic," their secondary rhetorical interests "Paragraph Structure and Development, Unity, Order." The first problem with the apparatus is that it has too many topics. Even if the primary focus is on limiting a topic, discussion of paragraph structure, unity, and order are too many things to take up in one lesson. Their disclaimer that since instructors will use only portions of the book, hence each apparatus is a self-contained unit is not satisfactory for me. Far from finding it a convenience, I see their method as leading to excessive duplication of effort and pedagogical confusion resulting from the introduction of too many ideas per essay. In this case, I feel they should have limited themselves to limiting a topic. That is sufficient material for one essay. The difficulties created by this method appear immediately in the questions. First, they tell the student too much, that Dickens has taken his insomnia for his subject and limited discussion to night walks, something it would have been better for students to find out for themselves by skillful questioning. The numbered questions follow, and they pose additional problems:

1. In what way or ways does Dickens further limit the topic "night walks" in Paragraphs 1-3?

> 2. What is the relationship between your answer to Question 1 and the subject of Paragraph 4? Although Paragraph 4 contains seemingly disparate material, it is nevertheless unified. Account for the relevance of all the material included in the paragraph and explain by what means unity is achieved.
> 3. What is the function of Paragraph 5 in the organization and progression of the essay?
> 4. Why do you think Dickens includes the toll-keeper in the essay? What is the function of this figure in Paragraph 6?
> 5. What is the function of the first sentence in Paragraph 7? What general statement can you make about the use of opening sentences in paragraphs throughout the essay? (37, 38)

Close examination of these first five questions reveals five different subjects for the student's consideration: limiting the topic, paragraph structure, organization of the whole, imagery and its function in an essay, and the function of topic sentences. That is too many subjects; that will not keep the rhetorical aim sharp. Regardless of the insights discussion of these questions yields, students are more likely to leave a class confused rather than enlightened about what they were supposed to have learned about the essay.

I have two other criticisms of this particular set of questions. There are nineteen, the first seventeen of which proceed mechanically from paragraph to paragraph in analyzing the essay. Of much more value would have been questions like 18 which attempts to establish some broad generalizations about the essay before picking away at its parts:

> At the beginning of the essay, Dickens says that his night walks gave him a "fair amateur experience of houselessness." As exemplified throughout and restated at the end, what is that experience, that is, what one state characterizes the night walkers whom Dickens personifies as Houselessness? (38)

My second criticism is of question 13, the "nothing" type question in this group. Some of these are scattered throughout the book. "Paragraph 13 is a particularly striking one. What elements contribute to its effectiveness?" I find such a question, particularly the ambiguity of "striking" analgous to the question, "What did you think of this essay?" with which I have heard many graduate assistants open a discussion in class. It suggests everything and nothing. It may be the work of a man too tired in his labors at that point to produce anything better. However, Kreuzer and Cogan can be explicit after questions of this kind. Question 7 begins with the ambiguous "Comment on the figure of the church steeples shaking the March winds (Paragraph 7)." But they do not stop there. They go on to ask specific questions which amplify the meaning of the question and to which meaningful responses are possible. "What does it mean and what image does it evoke? What other images does it call to mind? What other image in the essay is similar?"

One set of questions, on Johnson's essay from The Rambler, deserves special attention. The questions stress traditional grammar. For example, they ask students to identify subjects and predicates, dependent and independent clauses, and in some cases, to produce these. This exercise material and its preface in which a hypothetical Mr. and Mrs. Caveman invent a language in which to communicate, implies that decisions of style in sentences are made from a grammatical point of view, that is, that the writer thinks about subjects, verbs, modifiers, and concectives as he composes his sentences, hence some analysis of them is useful in teaching students to make similar decisions. I know of no study which proves that knowledge of grammar is at all useful for writing. Many people who don't know the terms of formal grammar write very well. Second, I question whether the key decisions in the production of sentences involve any active awareness of grammar. Writers use subjects, predicates, modifiers, clauses, phrases, etc. intuitively. From their knowledge of the language and from a mysterious process of absorption and re-synthesis which studies in creativity are just beginning to expose, they put together combinations of words. For that matter, any sensitive speaker of English knows how to write a grammatical sentence whether or not he knows grammatical terms. I believe the key decisions for a writer and his predications are word order (his intuition of whether subject should precede verb, modifier precede or follow the word modified, etc.) and diction. The writer often makes these decisions, I believe, according to his sense of the cadence of the sentence. He knows what his stressed and unstressed syllables are doing, and he wants something fluent. The cadence of a sentence affects the choice of words, too. Finally, a writer is usually conscious of a train of thought as it develops and he tries to be consistent in carrying it to its logical conclusion.

Suggested theme topics, like the questions in the exercises are of uneven quality. The editors say some will deal with literary topics, others will "provide opportunities for dealing with the problems of the major forms of discourse--exposition, narration, description, and argument." They vary from the respectable to the very bad. For example, a literary topic which should produce respectable themes follows Poe's "A Cask of Amontillado" and Saki's "The Reticence of Lady Anne":

> Write a theme in which you compare Saki's story with Poe's "Cask of Amontillado." Which one do you think is the better story? Which one more adequately meets Poe's concept of the short story? Make clear the criteria on which your judgment is based. (14)

This topic requires the student to commit himself to a position, asks for his reasons for taking that position, and gives him some criteria for making his decision. It could be fuller, but it will do.

In one of the sections devoted to limiting a topic students are asked to study a historic personality (this follows an essay on Roosevelt and Hopkins) and then write about some aspect of this person. This is a legitimate assignment, and it warns the students to avoid a bugaboo magazine editors constantly face: the writer who comes in and asks if he can do a story on X personality. To which the editor inevitably replies, "What kind of a story? What are you going to say about this person?"

Less satisfactory is their alternate assignment:

> Select a process with which you are thoroughly familiar, such as bathing a baby or making spaghetti sauce or changing a tire. Write a theme in which you give a step-by-step account of this process as you yourself perform it. It It will be your special writing problem not only to make the process clear to the reader, but to reveal something about yourself. (29)

I have commented on this type of theme in another paper.[10] Its subject matter is simply not respectable for a college course. This type of analysis of a process may produce writers of directions on labels; I heartily doubt its efficacy in producing writers who wish to explicate historical, social, or political processes for educated readers.

A much more intellectually respectable topic follows narratives by Swift, Wells, and Edgar Rice Burroughs:

> Both H. G. Wells and Edgar Rice Burroughs faced Swift's problem of having to gain credibility for the fantastic or incredible. Write an analysis of the Wells and Burroughs excerpts in which you compare the means each uses to solve

> the problem; include in your analysis an evaluation of the success each writer achieves. (267)

Coming in a section devoted to the study of credibility, the topic is most appropriate. Furthermore, it concentrates upon some writers' solutions to a literary-compositional problem. Students thus must think not only analytically about the work under consideration, but about the techniques which go in putting something together. This is at the heart of the composition process.

Unfortunately, among the theme topics to be found in this text is that ultimate banality of composition courses, the theme about a theme. (See page 192) It is the ultimate parasite, the subject feeding on itself for lack of something better. My first teaching mentor, a distinguished member of our profession now, instructed those of us teaching under him to avoid this particular topic as we would a viper.

Of Literature For Composition we may say the following things in summary: Many of the selections and the authors represented here are first-rate. However, the book needs, despite the editors' disclaimers, a more purposeful arrangement of rhetorical considerations within the sections. And the rhetorical considerations should be fewer for each apparatus. Less concern with secondary issues, more concentration on larger issues would be more useful to students. Improvement in the rhetorical arrangement of the book would improve the usefulness of the rhetorical apparatus. Students could then see certain sets of exercises related to others, not set apart, or duplicatious, as they now are.

A final observation. Despite the good intentions of the editors, I feel this type of anthology is not likely to be accepted for long by many schools. The practice of using a rhetoric and supporting it with the teacher's own choice of belletristic materials, which are available in incredible variety and in inexpensive paperback editions, is too convenient and too desirable for many teachers of English.

> Anderson, Wallace L. and Norman C. Stageberg. Introductory Readings on Language, rev. ed., New York, 1966. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Anderson and Stageberg's book was one of the first and most successful of the collections of readings about language. And the editors make perfectly clear that it is designed for use in the freshman English course:

> This book, is designed primarily as a text for freshman English, though it should also prove useful in the increasing number of undergraduate English courses devoted to the study of language." (v)

The question then is, how is it to be employed in freshman English courses? The editors are explicit on this point also. Introductory Readings on Language will serve:

> 1. To present basic information about language as a subject interesting and important in its own right. The intent is to make the students aware of the nature of language and some of its multifarious aspects.
> 2. To make students more perceptive of the artistic uses of language in literature.
> 3. To arouse the students' intellectual curiousity about language to the point where they want to know more about it.
> 4. To influence the students' own use of language and to enable them to cope more successfully with the welter of words, both spoken and written, that surrounds us all. (v)

The expectations of item 1 are completely realized in this text. It offers essays on "The Nature of Language," "Language History," "Words: Forms and Meanings," "Semantics," "Language and Literature," "The Sounds of Language," "Usage," "Linguistic Geography," grammar (with special emphasis on the new grammars), and logic. There is plenty of basic material written by people who are recognized authorities in their fields: Edward Sapir, L. M. Myers, Irving Copi, Albert Marckwardt, S. I. Hayakawa, I. A. Richards, C. S. Lewis, Bergen Evans, Hans Kurath, W. Nelson Francis, Paul Roberts, and Lionel Ruby, to name only some of the most distinguished.

The book's carrying out of objective 2 is not quite so satisfactory. Only one section comprising but 93 of the book's 551 pages, is devoted to language and literature. It may be argued that other sections, particularly those on word forms and meanings and semantics will be equally useful, but they do not address themselves to the particular use of language that section 5 does. The section itself consists of some poems, critical essays, and a few short stories. These, while excellent in themselves, seem inadequate to accomplish the purpose stated by the editors.

Objective 3 may also be open to question. Arousing students' intellectual curiosity about language is a noble purpose; realizing it is quite another thing. At the University of Illinois, where this text was used for two years, either because of poor presentation or lack of student interest, or the character of the essays on language, the curiosity did not develop. I suspect some of the reasons were that students were bored to death with the phonetic alphabet or linguistic geography with its individually interesting but wearying compilation of data about such things as the exact number of times a speaker used "skillet" or "frying pan" or some other term. For sheer readability, the sections on semantics, language and literature, usage (because it attacks prejudices and deals with controversial issues) and logic are the most interesting. The others are pretty dull simply because the subject matter is not of that much interest to most persons.

The editors' fourth objective, and it is the one most closely related to composition--"to influence the students' own use of language"--rests upon some implicit and very shaky assumptions:

> It is our conviction that the major concern of freshman English should be language. Most freshman English courses are planned to help students to write with clarity, if not with grace, and to read with understanding and discrimination. Usually, composition is taught in conjunction with a book of readings containing examples of good writing in a variety of styles and on a variety of topics. This variety of topics can prove troublesome. Oftentimes discussion tends to center in the content of the essays, so that the instructor finds himself of necessity taking on the role of sociologist, historian, scientist, and philosopher. The topics dealt with are important ones, to be sure, but they are probably better treated elsewhere by specialists in those fields. To the extent that this shift in roles occurs, the course becomes blurred; it loses its focus. Moreover, it inhibits the instructor's dealing with one of the subjects in which he is at home, namely, language. And this is one thing students need to know more about. (v, vi)

The first questionable assumption is that the study of language, more than that of a variety of topics, will help students to become better writers. The second is that teachers of the composition course are more likely to be competent in this area than in the diverse areas represented by omnibus collections of readings. L. M. Myers, one of the authors represented in this text, as much as says that we don't know yet how much the study of language or any other subject will improve student writing. Almost in direct refutation of the editors of this text, he says, "I have no sympathy with the idea that freshman English is a service course, designed to prepare students for worthier activity in other fields--or at least to provide instructors in those fields with a convenient alibi for not insisting that their students write connected sense. *But I have little more with the idea that it should be aimed at the mastery of any particular body of content.* [italics mine] Its most reasonable purpose is the development of skill in one of the most essential of all human activities."[11]

As for the second assumption, our experience at Illinois suggested that graduate students who teach freshman English have little more experience with language than with the variety of topics the omnibus anthology requires them to teach.[12] Their training is in the analysis of literature (which, as I pointed out earlier, does not necessarily qualify them to be teachers of writing either), and they do prefer to teach literature. I am not defending the study of literature for the composition course. I am just trying to refute the argument that teachers are qualified to teach language. I had only two graduate advisees who were qualified, and both were linguists. A common criticism of the material of the text was that it left the teacher nothing to teach. If the student absorbed the information provided by the essay, there was nothing more to do with it. Our assistants insisted, and this is a matter of opinion, of course, that the essays in this book, with some notable exceptions, were not distinguished organizationally or stylistically.

Anderson and Stageberg's best defense of the book is of its contents:

> College freshmen are, for the most part, linguistically unsophisticated. Their attitudes toward language are often naive; indeed, they have many misconceptions about language--misconceptions which they share with the general populace. One function of the English instructor is to rid college

> students of these misconceptions, to replace false beliefs with a more enlightened view of language in general, and of their own language in particular. For many college students, the freshman course is the only place where these students will have the opportunity to gain real insight into the workings of language. They should not come to us naive and leave older but still naive in a matter of such vital import. Hence this book of readings on language. (vi)

The teaching of language as a necessary and vital humanistic discipline is defensible. I would not quarrel with it; I would support it. But as a specific aid to composition, it is definitely questionable. The editors elaborate further upon their rationale for the content of the book:

> These essays constitute an introductory course in language. Although they deal with various linguistic topics, they are not a course in linguistics. They are intended to be complementary to a composition text or handbook; hence matters of rhetoric and mechanics have for the most part been excluded. The readings have been selected on the basis of three criteria: (1) that they be soundly informative, (2) that they be in line with current linguistic thought, and (3) that they be within the intellectual reach of the average freshman. (vi)

The editors, true to their word, have very little rhetorical material here; nothing at all in the way of handbook aids exists. The essays are informative, as they promise,and they seem to be in line with current linguistic thought, although I am not fully qualified to judge this matter. My knowledge of current grammars suggests, for example, that they are up-to-date although the omission of essays by Noam Chomsky could be repaired. They are not all that difficult; besides, it would seem fitting to represent the inventor of transformational grammar. The materials also seem to be within the intellectual grasp of freshmen. I do think Sapir's heavy-footed polysyllabic opening essay, "Language Defined," discouraging to readers. But Myers' "Language, Logic, and

Grammar," which follows it,is refreshing. The Follett-Evans controversy livens up the middle of the book,and Darrel Huff's "Post Hoc Rides Again," near the conclusion, is an unusually lively treatment of logic.

Anderson and Stageberg, commenting on the organization of the contents in the book cannot escape the freshman reader "disclaimer." But they are more assertive than some editors:

> The arrangement of topics is one that makes sense to us. However, it is not inflexible. The most appropriate order will depend, as it should, on the ingenuity of the instructor and his view of the course.

The truly annoying thing about this kind of disclaimer, as I have been pointing out, is that instructors who do not like their organization will obviously rearrange the materials of the book. We want to know why they think their organization has merit. Here are the section headings: "The Nature of Language," "Language History," "Words: Forms and Meanings," "Semantics," "Language and Literature," "The Sounds of Language," "Usage," "Linguistic Geography," "Structural and Transformational Grammar," and "Clear Thinking." It is probably as good an arrangement as any but why not put history ahead of the nature of language, "The Sounds of Language" right after history and the nature of language, and why not link the sections on linguistic geography and the history of language? These are the kinds of questions the editors could anticipate.

The editors explain the instructional apparatus and its functions as follows:

> In addition to the explanatory footnotes, we have included three kinds of editorial assistance: headnotes, suggested assignments, and lists of further readings. These are an integral part of the book. The headnotes prepare the students

> for the reading to follow by providing background material and by raising questions. Their purpose is to arouse interest, to stimulate thought, and to direct attention to the particular issues involved. The "assignments" are in a sense extensions of the readings themselves. Their purpose is to make the readings more meaningful by giving the students an opportunity to come to grips with specific issues by means of a variety of oral and written assignments. Many of the assignments are adaptable to either discussion or written work. The readings are included as a source of information for research papers; they may also serve to open more doors for those students desirous of gaining further insight into the nature of language. (vii)

This apparatus is the real strength of this book. The introductory notes are lucid and helpful; the bibliographies are generally good. Best of all are the exercises over the material. They go far beyond eliciting reaction to certain ideas or repetition of content. They are imaginative in that they involve the student in the intellectual processes whereby knowledge they are acquiring was originally obtained. The three examples which follow are inadequate, of course, to represent the full range of exercise material offered, but they give an indication of its nature and scope. From the section on usage:

> Many composition textbooks and handbooks contain a section on items of usage, often entitled "Glossary of Usage" or "Glossary of Diction" (sometimes "Faulty Diction"), with comments about the acceptability or nonacceptability of these items as Standard American English and their appropriateness to various language situations. Compare the judgments of any three textbooks about each of the following: aggravate, different from-different than, due to, enthuse, farther-further, like, who-whom (interrogative). Then look up each of the items in three dictionaries, compare the dictionary statements with each other and with your original findings, and present your data to the class for discussion. (378)

This exercise opens the eyes of students to the relativity of good usage and the folly of prescribing it very quickly. From the section on linguistic geography:

> Assume that you are a linguistic field-worker planning an interview with an informant. You want to find out which

> grammatical forms he uses in sentence situations like those listed below. If you ask him point-blank, he may report the one he thinks to be "correct" instead of what he normally uses. Devise the means whereby you can get him to use the forms in parentheses below, or whatever he naturally uses instead of them, and then go ahead with an interview.
>
> a. He (dived dove) from the high board.
> b. She (had drank had drunk) all her medicine.
> c. You (hadn't ought ought not) to drive so fast.
> d. Yesterday he (lay laid) in bed all day.
> e. My shirt (shrank shrunk) in the laundry.
> f. It (don't doesn't) matter.
> g. He (waked up woke up) early.
> h. She lives (on in) Broad Street.
> i. This is (all the further as far as all the farther) I go.
> j. Who (rang rung) the bell? (421, 422)

Students like this exercise because it calls for role playing in a specific situation which is easy for them to visualize. It also makes the work of the classroom become something more than an exercise. They get some of the pleasure of genuine data gathering. From the section on Grammar:

> Fries points out that if a sentence contains words whose form-class (part of speech) classificatinn is unclear, the sentence will contain a structural ambiguity, that is, it will have two possible meanings. In the following newspaper headlines, point out the structural ambiguities caused by form-class uncertainty:
>
> A. SUSPECT SHOT AFTER HOLDUP
> B. EUROPE CROOKS BECKONING FINGER AT LOCAL RESIDENTS
> C. OPEN HOUSE FOR NEW SCHOOL
> D. RULE BOOK NOT OBSCENE

Generally speaking, the exercises reveal a thorough knowledge of the material by the editors. More important, they are not the product of a few hurried moments. The editors have spent a great deal of time developing them; it is definitely not material created off the tops of their heads.

The strong points of *Introductory Readings In Language* are its content, the authority of the experts represented (despite the fact that some are dull writers), and its exercise material. The book can also be defended as an educational tool for providing students knowledge of a subject which should concern them deeply. As a specific aid to the learning of written composition, however, it would be difficult to defend.

Guerard, Albert, and Maclin Guerard, John Hawkes, and
Claire Rosenfield. The Personal Voice. New York, 1964.
J. B. Lippincott.

The Personal Voice appears, at first glance, to be yet another omnibus reader like The Essential Prose, The Borzoi College Reader, and Toward Liberal Education. But the editors' statement of purpose, reproduced at great length here, reveals a new direction, one highly relevant to the production of good writing:

> The primary purpose of this book is to encourage the reading and writing of good prose, together with the qualities of mind and spirit on which good prose depends. (v)
>
> Our basic assumption is that reading and writing are highly personal acts and should engage the whole person. They should involve not merely one part of the self--say the logical capacity of the introspective impulse--but the whole man who has had certain important experiences and who has scrutinized them sensitively and with care. Bad prose often gives the impression of having been ground out by a machine or laboriously constructed according to certain rigid principles. But all good writing (even the most objectively scientific and descriptive and even the most ornate or poetic) is related to the speaking voice. Good prose reads well aloud. (v, vi)

One notices immediately that the editors seem to be reacting against the conception of freshman composition as a kind of "bread and butter" course. Their point is that any kind of good writing engages the whole personality and is made distinctive by the particular way that personality has of communicating his insights.[13] The editors go on to explain, in more detail, what they mean by "voice":

> "Voice, in good writing, is the liberated yet controlled expression of a human being deeply committed to what he is saying. A true voice will appear, if at all, when the writer ceases to evade or merely toy with his ideas and with his personal experience. (vi)
>
> The over-all objective, as we see it, is to master both lucidity and richness. We should like students to appreciate prose that is at once clear, supple, eloquent, and even "beautiful," and to be able to write such prose. The capacities to read and write are intimately related in turn to understanding, knowledge, imagination, compassion. The most valuable personal prose, finally, is that which escapes "mere personality" and which escapes our seeming imprisonment in space and time. (viii)

Although not explicitly stated, the assumption is that the ability to read and detect the personal voice in the writings of professionals will enable students to develop a voice in their own writing. That is questionable. And there are other aspects of this rationale which are ambiguous and deserve clarification. For example, "clear," "supple," and "eloquent" are weasel words when applied to writing. They have no cognitive value at all.

The editors' purpose, as stated, is to teach both good reading (with their special emphasis on the recognition of voice) and good writing. Particularly, they are concerned to show students how to detect the personal voice and to develop it in their work. The more remote philosophical justification for this activity is humanistic, helping the student to develop "understanding, knowledge,imagination, compassion." This is a kind of doctrine of liberation from the self through a realization of the self. It echoes a conception of the nature of literary creativity in T. S. Eliot's famous essay, "Tradition and the Individual Talent":

> Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape

> from emotion; it is not the expression of personality but an escape from personality. But, of course, only those who have personality and emotions know what it means to want to escape from these things.[14]

These ideals, however desirable, are impossible of realization in a freshman writing course. But, as Thoreau long ago advised men to set the highest goals for themselves lest they achieve nothing, so perhaps it is justifiable to set unrealizable goals for the freshman course. What one accomplishes may be infinitely more worthwhile than the setting and accomplishing of "reasonable" goals.

The rationales of two of this book's sections, "The Journey Within" and "Imagination, Fantasy, Dream," offer further insights into the distinctive aspects of The Personal Voice:

> The longest section of the book, The Journey Within, is possibly the most important for the student writer. It presents a number of autobiographical, self-analytic essays and covers a broad range of experience from happy childhood to schizophrenic turmoil. The assumption of the editors is that serious autobiographical writing provides one of the sharpest of literary challenges. If the writer can look closely and sensitively at himself, at both present and past crises, and at the darkest and most confused reaches of his experience--then he can look closely and sensitively at anything. This is one reason why we believe personal writing, with all its temptations to circle and evade and disguise, may help the student achieve precision and lucidity. Even the writing of subjective fiction may help train the student to write unevasively on scientific subjects or in the areas of history, sociology, and political science. (vi)
>
> The final section is frankly an experiment. But we believe that the experiment is a valid one. It derives from the experience of the editors in teaching writing, and from their feeling that much undergraduate writing is dull and unpersuasive because the writer has repressed some of his most audacious and most original ideas. The minds of young people are not dull, though their prose frequently is. Interesting similes, metaphors, combinations, and juxtapositions flicker into consciousness and are at once rejected as improper or absurd, beneath the dignity of a college essay. The student, feeling guilty about grotesque fantasies, suppresses

> them at once. But some of the best writing comes, surely, from the disciplined, controlled, conscious use of what the unconscious mind most unpredictably asserts. Even rigorous scientists, talking of sudden major discoveries, treat such eruptions with respect. The student whose sole aim is to write correct scientific prose may benefit, we suggest, from some exposure to the unconventional. (viii)

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of the generalizations made here. The key point is that young writers have the creative gift but are afraid to use it. The question becomes why? Why does a young person restrain his most promising impulses in favor of dull plodding prose? The answer must be that he responds to what he believes (often with good reason) to be the expectations of his composition teachers. The editors are to be commended for striking out in new directions, for encouraging and rewarding genuine creativity and for leading it ultimately to disciplined creativity.

On the contents of their book, the editors offer a variety of remarks, some of them traditional, but the emphasis still on their peroccupation with voice:

> The selections are intended to challenge, stimulate, excite--to challenge preconception, stimulate intellectual energies, excite both imagination and compassion. Above all, they are intended to serve as high examples of lucid and persuasive expression. All the arts of rhetoric and resources of logic will be found in these essays. Yet most of them give the impression of serious men and women speaking to serious listeners. No place has been made for the trivial familiar essay, nor for the merely journalistic document. The writing in this volume is, in the best sense, and for all the flights of imagination and humor it may take, "serious." The emphasis is obviously on contemporary experience and writing. But we have tried to represent, more than is usual, the most varied kinds of literary excellence. (v)

On this score, they are good to their word. The writing is serious; it is also excellent. Twentieth-century authors predominate. (Of the sixty-two writers represented in this anthology, only six died before 1900.) And a cross-section of their names reveal the varieties of subject matter they represent: Conrad, Stendhal, Yeats, Howe, Thomas, Connolly, Nabokov, Stegner, Kazin, Baldwin, Fitzgerald, Gide, Thoreau, Oppenheimer, Eisely, Benedict, Forster, Faulkner, Santayana, Beebe--the list goes on and on. I found only one selection in the book which was really dull: Julian Huxley's "The Size of Living Things."

The Personal Voice is organized into six sections: I. "Outward Journeys"; II. "The Journey Within"; III. "Intellectual Adventures"; IV. "American Problems"; V. "Literary Criticism"; VI. "Imagination, Fantasy, Dream." The unifying principle is the editors' insistence that what distinguishes each of the pieces in each section, whether it be travel writing, autobiography, philosophy, history, science, literary criticism, fiction, or poetry, is the particular voice of the writer, the personality behind the work. In defense of the editors, I would say that this personality does emerge in the great bulk of the selections. Even the scientists write like human beings.

Because of the nature of this book, the order of the essays, particularly within sections, is not a pressing problem. This is not a set of topics broken down into further sub-topics. These are types of essays distinguished because of the way they are written. This point is brought home once again, for example, in the prefaces to Parts Three, "Intellectual Adventures," and Four, "American Problems":

> The essays in Part Three, Intellectual Adventures, involve the natural and behavioral sciences and present lucid expository writing of divers kinds. They also suggest some of the challenges to the poetic imagination that exist in the natural world. . . . Most of the essays on American Problems may also be called "personal." There was no attempt, in this section, to seek essays for their subjects alone or because they seemed controversial. Instead, our interest was in how the controversial may become personal. We learn that public issues, which so often seem remote and abstract, may reach down and touch intimately our own consciousness and experience. (vii)

Unhappily, this fine book is not free of that curse, the eternal disclaimer about organization:

> The division into sections is at times fairly arbitrary. Both instructor and student may want to institute other groupings. Charles Darwin, William Beebe, and Herman Melville coudl, for instance, be read in sequence, since all three attempt to render the desolate Galápagos Islands. But vast differences in the personalities of these three men and in the intention of their essays result in wholly different voices. (viii)

Precisely. And following a fine defense of the book, its rationale, content, and pedagogy, this disclaimer is especially disheartening. One wants to believe that it was a publisher's idea, the ever present reminder that a book can be anything the instructor wants it to be, hence desirable. Humbug.

Three kinds of instructional aids are offered in The Personal Voice: prefaces to the various sections plus little biographical notes on each author; discussion questions on the essays assembled at the back of the text; a set of notes for instructors prepared by Joseph Brown. They vary considerably in quality.

The biographical notes, though brief, are well written and useful. They tell the student what he wants to know: who the writers are, when they lived (or were born), what they have written that distinguished them, what they are doing now, and from which of their works the essays in the anthology are taken.

The introductions to the individual sections continue to hammer away at the editors' central preoccupation: the need for hearing a personal voice in each of the essays. Some examples follow:

> The first section of this volume offers a series of non-fictional narratives of personal adventure and travel. All seven narratives are by men keenly interested in life,

> and who refuse to be satisfied with the commonplace. We feel a personality and hear a voice in each of the seven. (3)
>
> Behind each of these four essays, one is aware of the writer as an individual and not as anonymous observer, recording dispassionately. Each stands between his material and the reader, sifting it, as it were; and his senses, like antennae, pass on even the most delicate impression. (217)
>
> An intellectual cliché forced upon us by our training and by the popular press is that the best critics of a society are dispassionate, clear-eyed, detached--and so able to seize upon and analyze objectively those lapses that the participant in any culture cannot or does not wish to see. For, the pseudo-scientist of culture reasons, to have a personal voice is to reveal subtle irrationalities in one's comments, whereas the civilized nature of social criticism demands individual repression. In each of the selections dealing with American problems, we have the authentic, uninhibited utterances of men who are very much concerned with the active world; but as in the other sections, there are varying levels of personal involvement, varying degrees of interaction among author, audience ~~of~~ reader, and society as a complex whole. And in lucid and serious prose they show us how social changes are reflected by changes in language itself, new words and metaphors by which we are then able to perceive those failures and threats that our collective myopia often denies. Only one of the eleven authors--the British anthropologist, Geoffrey Gorer--is a European, thus conforming at least ideologically and politically to the definition of objective observer of American culture. But most of the criticism here is by men at once aware of the paradoxes of American life and fearful of their own complicity in its failures. Historically and/or personally guilt-ridden, they use the written word as a means of liberating the past and exploring the possibilities of the future. (329)

This last statement, by Claire Rosenfield, is the best of the lot, although she is the most tiresome summarizer of the essays in the sections she edits.

In general, these introductory essays to sections are useful for explicating the general theme and tone of a section and for inforcing the particular perspective in studying them which this text seeks. However, in some cases, particularly in the preface to section IV, they become a tiresome series of brief explications. Students should not be told so much. The teacher is left with two problems: either to make his discussion of an essay a defense of generalizations made by the specific editor writing the preface to the section, or to disregard the prefatory material and start a whole new line of inquiry against resistance from a class which has read the preface and come with preconceived ideas about an essay or story.

The prefatory essays establish one vital link between reading and writing, however. The preface to section II, by Albert Guerard, has, in its discussion of the material of the section, some splendid observations on personal writing for the student:

> The present section is concerned with frankly autobiographical and self-evaluative writing, although some fiction is included. Almost without exception these selections involve acts of evaluative memory: not merely renderings of experience but assessments of experience. The mature recollecting writer is now capable of understanding events, incidents, emotions that may have been confused or incomprehensible at the time they were experienced, and for this very reason he is now more capable of understanding himself. The act of autobiographical writing thus becomes an act of successful separation from a self that had been confused or helpless; in some sense art has triumphed over life.
>
> Yet our lives would be impoverished if, in the act of understanding our past experience, we forgot what it had seemed to us at the time. This is the great challenge to the serious subjective or autobiographical writer. He should be able to evoke sensations of the past; to bring back to life both the past experience and the past self--to be lonely, afraid, humiliated, confused, filled with hatred or with love. . . . But also he must achieve meaning; he must order, clarify, understand. He must recognize the difference between the child who suffers and the man who remembers. One of them can be, paradoxically enough, a heated, violent, seemingly uninhibited expression of "naked emotion" or even of raw confession. The writer has substituted heat for light, a specious intensity for clarity. There are indeed no limits to the ways in which a man can avoid looking very closely at himself. Even violent self-abasement of self-condemnation may prove such a way. For behind all this humiliating confession may lie, unconfessed and as it were buried under verbiage, the act or experience to be concealed at all cost. (69,70)

This is the explicit statement which calls for writing which vibrates with the intensity of felt emotion, yet is the product of a disciplined creativity which has achieved sufficient distance on experience so that it can recreate the intensity of the past without present involvement. This, as I have pointed out, is what Eliot seeks for poetry. It certainly is what these editors seek to initiate and develop in student autobiographical writing. Many of their examples are splendid exemplifications of what Guerard is talking about: Yeats' "A Reverie over Childhood and Youth" from the *Autobiography*; James Agee's "A Visit To Grandma's" from *A Death in the Family*; Nabokov's "Colette" from *Speak, Memory*; an excerpt from Baldwin's *Notes of a Native Son*; and the conclusion to *Walden*.

The questions for discussion contained in the book itself vary greatly in quality and usefulness. The first ones are often good, seeking a way into a particular essay. When the second and third and fourth questions are good, they provide a discernible progression in a discussion of an essay. They lead from one related point to another, usually beginning broadly and continually sharpening the focus of any line of inquiry. Another aspect of the good questions in the section is their leading to some exposure of voice. But there are some incredibly bad questions, too. I will illustrate both types by example and comment. The first question on Darwin's "Tierra del Fuego" is excellent: "Since it was written by a naturalist on a surveying expedition, Darwin's record of his observations is both precise and objective. Does he ever invest his factual description with value judgments and emotive language? If so, where?" (593) The question opens up discussion immediately into the kind of inquiry these editors invite. It should expose the personal voice in the essay. The first question on Richard Ford's "Bull Fight" is also good. "In this apparently objective report of the ritual of the bull fight, does Ford manifest his own opinion toward the proceedings? What language and images, if any, suggest an intellectual judgment of the spectacle? What is his attitude toward the bull, the matador, the populace?" (595) These questions, essentially about content and technique, are also to the point. They will expose the personal voice. Even a simple content question such as the one which opens discussion of William Carlos' Williams" "The Destruction of Tenochtitlan" can be justified as a means of determining how closely students have read the material.

On the other hand, there are absurdities. The fifth question on the Ford essay, "How does Ford use allusion?" is the intellectual equivalent of a student's exam answer that author X "uses" alliteration, personification, etc. or some other device, the implication being that he impressed his device on his material in a mental process resembling the impressing of a seal in hot wax. Authors do not "use" devices this way. They allude, they personify, they alliterate, but not, I am sure, in the consicous way such questions and naive student answers imply. When one contrasts this question with the excellent first one on Ford's essay, he is tempted to believe that different persons prepared the questions on the essay.

Some of the questions tell students things they should be permitted to work out for themselves, for example this question on Baldwin's essay: "Baldwin's essay deals importantly with his attitude toward his father, as well as with the experience of being a Negro in a hostile environment. Hatred of the father, rage, bafflement, sympathy for him--all are conveyed, from beginning to end, in controlled, measured, relatively intellectual language." (595) Other questions are so overpowering in their demands that students are likely to give up on them before starting. For example, we find this comprehensive question on Edwin Honig's "A Seed in the Sky": "Edwin Honig is primarily a poet. Analyze the diction, syntax, imagery--all the concerns of style--that reveal the personal voice of a writer of verse. How does he turn thought into emotion and experience?" (595) I will cite one other example of [illegible] bad question. It is question six of the Williams' essay: "In characterizing both Cortez and Montezuma, the author again must control the relationship between his sympathetic identification and his moral judgment. What techniques and stylistic devices enable him to do this?" (593) This type of question is virtually unintelligible to most freshmen I have taught or observed. The trouble with it is that it does not communicate with students. Terms like prose rhythms, imagery, aesthetic distance, objectification of experience, control of material (here the concept of controlling "the relationship between his sympatheitc indentification and his moral judgment") are unintelligible to students. The matter presented for student thought and discussion is important; the jargon in which it is presented, however, is self-defeating.

Mr. Brown's Notes for Instructors is a more useful tool. It is prefaced by an excellent note from the editors, one tinged with a bit of sarcasm, as it tells teachers, in the language of the organizational disclaimer, that they may use the book as they please, but that the way in which it is intended to be used is ultimately superior to other pedagogical schemes:

> There are many ways in which The Personal Voice may be used in the classroom, and each teacher will have his preferred strategy. The teacher concerned with the essay as a literary form will find abundance and diversity. So too will the teacher interested in the varieties of prose style and in the many devices of rhetoric. The analyst of simile and metaphor, of controlled irony and distance, will find Parts I, II, and VI particularly useful. All the normal processes of logical argument and persuasion, of definition and analysis, are also represented throughout the book, but expecially in Parts III, IV, and V.

Significantly, having tipped their editorial hats politely and a wee bit condescendingly to traditionalists who teach freshman writing courses, the editors then proceed to impress once again their basic preoccupation with the discovery by the student of his own voice in writing. Their remarks, strategically following those just quoted, imply that they are confident their approach to the teaching of writing is considerably superior to traditional methods:

> The teacher interested in psychological and developmental problems, in the student as a human being at a critical moment in his life, will find pertinent and stimulating selections in each of the six parts. The editors of The Personal Voice are deeply committed to the belief that the emotions must be enlisted in any meaningful activity, however impersonal or abstract and intellectual that activity may seem at first. The college freshman especially, full of enthusiasm and ambition but also perhaps full of anxiety, is often rigid and inhibited in his attitudes, overly self-protective, unnecessarily distrustful both of outward authority and of his own impulses and his own fantasy life. He may need a kind of liberation; may need to learn to live not more loosely but with more inward freedom and resilience. At the brink of the great adventure of university life he may need some encouragement to venture forth into the unknown or unfamiliar, and into the areas of relative rather than absolute truth. (Notes for Instructors, iii)

Bending to the trend of the times, the editors have provided a neat rhetorical index to supplement the regular table of contents. This commercial gesture is most undesirable in a book which offers so much in the way of writing of great personal integrity.

Most of the instructional aid rendered in the pamphlet is in the form of brief but intelligent explications of the essays. Of more significance and more practical value are occasional suggestions for presenting the material to students. I have singled out a few examples of Mr. Brown at his best. For example, of the Williams' essay, he says, "The obvious question to ask students first about the Williams piece is: where do their sympathies lie, with Cortez or Montezuma? And then: how are those sympathies engaged?" (1) The answers to those questions will reveal the author's thesis and his voice, both desirable goals for this book. An equally pertinent question occurs in Brown's comments on Stendhal's "Rome": "Although the selection is short, this might be the time to ask students directly a question that would be pertinent throughout their reading of the anthology: what can they deduce about Stendhal's character and personality? what sort of man is he?" (4) Under the heading "Concluding Selections of Part III" is yet another set of really good questions in this manual. They lead to significant insights and they build upon one another: "The questions to ask are these: How much emotional energy do Forster, Michelet, Bate, and Schorer expend in their descriptions of dying? What is the extent of their emotional (or moral) commitment to the people whom they describe as suffering the experience of death? How is the identification revealed?" (22)

Summarizing, I would say, of The Personal Voice, that the selections are superb, the organization justified, and the instructional apparatus uneven. The editors carry through their intent to expose "voice" in the writings they present. A basic question about this anthology remains. Will these essays teach students how to produce in their own writing the sense of commitment and individuality exhibited by the writers of the essays in the text? The answer must be only so far as prose models are effective devices for teaching written composition. And that is a point to which I will come shortly.

9 THE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF ALL 77 READERS

The content analysis of the readers included in the study sought answers to these questions: (1) do typical anthologies draw their materials from a wide range of sources, both contemporary and historical, or do they duplicate each other excessively; (2) do these sources represent a broad or narrow range of political, social, religious, scientific, and humanistic points of view? It is not possible to answer these questions definitely because the data obtained can be interpreted in a number of ways. However, the information from the content analysis provides some positive information about readers which heretofore has been merely speculation. I would like to point out immediately, however, that any generalizations made here apply only to the seventy-seven readers used in the study. These generalizations may be valid for other readers if the group I have collected is a typical one. I take it to be that from the information supplied by directors of freshman composition programs and publishing houses.

To get the data for the content analysis, two graduate students at the University of Illinois spent the summer and early Fall of 1967 recording these facts about every essay, poem, book chapter, preface, newspaper article, book review, etc. which appeared in these anthologies: (1) the title of the selection, (2) its author, (3) the date of publication, (4) the source (magazine, book, newspaper, etc.), (5) the type of piece it was, usually according to subject matter or literary form (education, history, philosophy, sociology, poem, short story, letter, etc.) and (6) the frequency of its occurrence.[15] When the results were in we had indexed almost 3,700 separate items. They revealed the marvelous diversity of materials in these books. One suspects that collectively they touch on all human knowledge. More interesting to me HOWEVER were certain instances of duplication. In the [illegible] 77 readers I found 99 authors who appear 10 or more times; 38, 20 or more times; 12 30 or more times; 5 more than 40; and but 2 who appeared more than 50 times. The twelve most represented authors, and the number of times each was represented follow:

George Orwell-57
James Thurber-50
Henry David Thoreau-46
E. B. White-42
E. M. Forster-41
H. L. Mencken-37
Mark Twain-34
Francis Bacon-33
Jonathan Swift-33
W. H. Auden-31
William Shakespeare-30
James Baldwin-30

The list suggests several things. If it is representative, we can say that, not surprisingly, essay anthologies draw most of their materials from contemporary authors. However, it is worth noting that five of the twelve most frequently anthologized authors lived prior to the twentieth century.

Of more than passing interest, was my discovery that of the thirteen most anthologized prose selections (essays, book chapters, translations, etc.) seven were pre-twentieth century. And they are classic pieces which every teacher of English recognizes. Here are the thirteen most anthologized prose pieces in order of frequency:

George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language"-19
Jonathan Swift, "A Modest Proposal"-18
Henry D. Thoreau, "Civil Disobedience"-12
E. M. Forster, "What I Believe"-12
James Baldwin, "Notes of a Native Son"-10
George Orwell, "Shooting An Elephant"-10
Francis Bacon, "Of Studies"-9
Thomas DeQuincey, "The Literature of Knowledge and the Literature of Power"-8
Bergen Evans, "But What's A Dictionary For?"-8
W. Nelson Francis, "Revolution in Grammar"-8
Thomas Huxley, "The Method of Scientific Investigation"-8
John Milton, "Areopagitica"-8
Plato, "The Allegory of the Cave"-8

This information gives us some idea how many students have the opportunity to read these essays. For example, "Politics and the English Language" and "A Modest Proposal" appear in virtually one-quarter of the anthologies in this study. In Orwell's case, the significance is even greater since "Shooting An Elephant" is also on the list. It speaks significantly of Orwell's potential influence on twentieth century culture. It would be an error, of course, to assume that Orwell is represented in TWENTY-NINE books. I did not tally cases of overlapping, books in which both essays might have appeared. Suffice it to say that Orwell is well represented in modern essay anthologies and exerts considerable influence indirectly, on the minds of many thousands of college students in America.

Because I was interested in seeing how much duplication between the present and the past has occurred, I scanned the contents of seventeen anthologies published between 1886 and 1933. The sampling was imperfect in that I have no way of knowing how widely adopted they were. Some are the work, however, of influential men in writing programs of that time: John Genung, Fred Newton Scott, George Rice Carpenter. Some of these books consisted primarily of literary criticism; others were rhetorics with some essays. Most of these authors took their materials from nineteenth century English essayists. However, when they dipped into other sources they most often went to Thoreau and Bacon, specifically to "Of Studies" and Walden. The latter has been and will surely continue to be one of the most influential books ever written in English. Missing from earlier essay anthologies were the translations from the great Greeks. These appear with considerable frequency in modern anthologies. I can think of one possible reason for this. The teaching of Latin and Greek, which has declined so much in our century, may still have been sufficiently widespread into the early twentieth century that large numbers of students were still reading the originals. Thus, anthology editors may have thought it absurd to provide translations.

I was interested, also, to see how widely essay anthologists spread their nets for materials. I found that they went very far indeed. Again, however, the more interesting aspects of the information were the patterns of source duplication. For example, when the anthologists turned to magazines and newspapers for their materials, five sources far outnumbered all others. Before naming them, however, I must point out the problems my compilers encountered in identifying sources. The greatest problem was determining the first place of publication of many pieces. Some essays, which we were sure appeared originally in periodicals, were listed simply as coming from the collected works of an author. We had neither the time nor the money to conduct an exhaustive search for the original facts of publication of some 3,700 pieces. Some essays were not identified by source at all. Therefore, the information I present here is to be taken as follows: it indicates the number of times we were able to determine positively that a given source was used. In some cases the number of entries is swelled by the repeated occurrence of a single essay. For example, Bergen Evans' "But What's A Dictionary For?" appeared originally in The Atlantic, and it turned up in eight different books. Thus I counted it as eight Atlantic entries.

As a magazine source, The Atlantic exceeds all other publications. It is represented 107 times in these anthologies. The New Yorker is represented 73 times, The Saturday Review of Literature, 63, Harper's, 60, and the New York Times and its supplements (book reviews and Sunday supplement), 58 times. The next most frequently used source, College English, is represented 24 times. Now, what exactly does this data, imperfect as it is, suggest? It may suggest that essay anthologists go to the best magazines for their materials. It may also suggest, however, that essay anthologists use each other's books a great deal, drawing most heavily on selections from "the big five." It may suggest that essay anthologists feel that the disparity in quality between the very best and most widely circulated of our literary magazines is sufficient to justify overlooking less well known literary and quarterly magazines. *The Writer's Market*, a marketing aid for free-lance writers, lists 181 "quarterly, literary, and 'little'" magazines, but few of these are represented in the anthologies. Next to *Harper's* and *The New York Times Book Review*, which appear in this list, the most frequently represented are the *Antioch, Kenyon*, and *Sewanee Reviews* plus *Daedalus*, *Encounter*, and *Dissent*. Popular magazines represented most frequently are *The Saturday Evening Post*, *Holiday*, *Fortune*, *Esquire*, *Life*, and *Look*. Only three professional publications in English appear: *College English*, *The English Journal*, and *PMLA*. Among the political magazines, *The Reporter* and *The New Republic* are represented 18 times each, the *National Review* but once. Other essays come from university quarterlies, reviews, and alumni publications, most of them from the *Yale Review*, the *Harvard* and *Michigan Alumni Bulletins*, and the *Virginia Quarterly Review*. *Scientific American* is the most frequently tapped source for articles of general interest in science.

Since the quality of the essays chosen is usually very good, except where an editor has deliberately chosen a bad piece to illustrate certain weaknesses, one cannot criticize editors for going to quality sources for their materials. However, I would suggest that more extensive and more careful perusal of a still wider range of quarterly and literary magazines is desirable.

Perhaps the best indicator of the wide range of sources from which these anthologies draw is the fact that only fifteen books have been repeatedly anthologized. I list those that were represented 10 or more times; they comprise an interesting group. Some are classics; the moderns are either topical or literarily significant because of their authors. Many of these books are essay collections under a single heading; I have not included collected works. In order of frequency of representation they are:

George Orwell, *Shooting An Elephant and Other Essays*-33
Francis Bacon-*Essays*-27
E. M. Forster, *Two Cheers for Democracy*-25
Henry D. Thoreau, *Walden*-24
James Baldwin, *Notes of a Native Son*-20
E. B. White, *The Second Tree from the Corner*-15
The English Bible-14 (hardly an essay collection but often represented)
John Henry Cardinal Newman, *The Idea of a University*-14
Virginia Woolf, *The Second Common Reader*-13
E. B. White, *One Man's Meat*-12
Herbert Gold, *The Age of Happy Problems*-12
Plato, *The Republic*-10
Albert C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language*-10
H. L. Mencken, *The American Language*-10
George Orwell, *Such, Such, Were the Joys*-10

I was unable to indicate collections of Thurber essays because individual pieces were usually listed by their first appearance. Thurber, however, belongs among this group of writers since he is one of the most anthologized writers of our century.

I checked the readers published between 1886 and 1933 for possible duplications but found little that was significant. The only magazine which is well represented both then and now is The Atlantic. The only books (some of those represented on the modern list obviously were not written at the time some of these earlier anthologies were published) significantly represented are Bacon's Essays and Walden. This information is hardly surprising.

Assessing the significance of this data about the content of these readers, I address myself once more to the two questions I posed about them (see p. 97). The answer to both questions must be that the anthologies do draw from a wide range of materials and they do represent a broad range of social, religious, scientific, and humanistic points of view. However, the extent of duplication between them does raise some provocative questions. Why are certain essays, essayists, and sources in a considerable number of these books? Perhaps because publishers and editors reason that teachers like a certain proportion of familiar essays among the unfamiliar. Obviously, certain kinds of anthologies repeatedly use classic statements in their areas, for example Orwell's "Politics and the English Language" which gets not only into omnibus readers but into those with a concentration on language. Borrowing by one editor from the works of others surely accounts for some of the duplication. The common tastes of teachers of English and their knowledge of certain materials is another factor. If one wants an ironic essay, for example, almost the first thing he thinks of is Swift's "Modest Proposal." The duplications, while intriguing, are not significant enough, however, to give one reason to insist on radical changes in the content of these readers.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Ultimately, the question of most importance concerning these readers, the question which subsumes all questions about content, organization, etc. is the question of rationale. Are they good tools for teaching composition because they are developed according to rationales which make sense in the teaching of written composition? Before attacking that question, I will summarize the rationales which appear most frequently in these texts. Then I propose to take a quick look at the past to see how much editors of anthologies have changed their ideas about the teaching of composition, and finally, with the aid of some new and some old studies in writing, to offer a brief critique of the modern anthology with some recommendations about what it can legitimately claim to do for students in writing courses.

Most teachers of freshman writing courses are quite familiar with the variety of rationales offered by the anthologies they use. Some of these I have already touched on in the analysis of the eight readers. Others have not been mentioned yet. I offer here what seem to me to be the common rationales in a rough but ascending order of frequency.

A few texts on the market offer essays on writing by professional writers, the assumption clearly being that these people have illuminating yet practical advice for the beginning writer. This advice usually boils down to an imperative: "Read widely and well."

A still lingering but outmoded position is that offered by editors of anthologies on language. The assumption was that the study of language is the proper content of a composition course and that acquisition of knowledge about language would make students better writers. A variation of this rationale occurs in Walker Gibson's The Limits of Language which has, among its objectives, the purpose of showing students what they can't say, how imperfect language is to accomplish the objective of full expression of our awareness and complete communication of experience. To the credit of the linguists, it must be said that they quickly developed a healthy skepticism about the efficacy of their methods. (See quote from L. M. Myers, pp. 78,79) Dudley Bailey, editor of a successful collection of readings on language observes that "the notion that a knowledge of one's language is certain to make for good writing reflects an attractive idealism, but a naive one; for some of our most knowledgeable linguists write abominably, and some of our most fetching writers on language are not entirely dependable."[16]

Another rationale which occurs frequently in a number of variations is the one which advocates stimulating the interest of students in new topics through the clash of ideas, usually with emphasis on the use of materials by current writers (while retaining, naturally, the best of the past). Both the teaching of composition and liberal education are served. This rationale occurs, in part, in the three large omnibus readers I examined, and in such texts as Francis Connolly's Man and His Measure. Connolly offers a collection of readings which examine fundamental questions: what is man? what are his capacities? These are to stimulate thinking which produces good writing. Alfred Kazin, editor of The Open Form, sees his collection of essays as teaching "us something about the possible responses of intelligence to the society in which we live we live." (ix) In addition, his book expresses a common concern with The Personal Voice: stress on the COMMITMENT of a writer to a subject. Yet another version of this rather loosely defined rationale is the statement that students acquire knowledge of themselves, their culture, and their literary heritage through reading and analysis of a certain set of essays. Ultimately, all of these approaches are humanistic: they see, as a major function of composition courses, the offering of a degree of liberal education to students.

Two rationales appear most frequently, however, as indicated from the responses of directors of freshman rhetoric courses (who are often the editors of collections of readings) and preface statements. The first is that these essay anthologies offer prose models for imitation. Usually, the models illustrate rhetorical modes, methods of development, etc. "No one," say Jerome Archer and Joseph Schwartz, editors of A Reader for Writers, "has yet found a better way to teach composition than by the use of prose models." (ix) Gregory Polleta, editor of Intention and Choice: The Character of Prose, is more cautious about claims for this method:

> [This book] tests the common assumption that one learns to write by reading examples of good writing and by imitating their modes of composition and expression. This is not the only way writing can be taught, but it is the method which is most extensively practiced. I happen to believe that the method can work as well as any other, and better than most, but if it is to be effective we must satisfy at least two conditions.
>
> One is that the models for imitation must be genuinely excellent. . . . The other condition . . . is that the student must be given some instruction in how to read. (vi)

Polletta's last remark leads to the related and most common rationale of all: that these essay collections can be used to teach critical reading and thinking which will enable a student to write critically and well. The basic assumption is that skill in analysis of good writing necessarily makes one a good writer. Since this is the commonest rationale for essay collections, it is the one I shall examine directly, but first I wish to take one more quick glance into the past to see how much our theory of the way writing should be taught, more specifically, theories of how readings are to be used in the teaching of writing, have changed.

In 1933, in his preface to The College Omnibus, one of the most widely adopted and successful readers of its era, James Dow McCallum said: "It is expected that The College Omnibus will solve the perennial question of the teacher of freshman English: Where can I find in one volume material sufficiently representative, sufficiently diversified and interesting for a semester (or year) course? Here is represented every type of literature which is studied in a freshman course." In an age which did not know the paperback book explosion McCallum obviously tried to produce a single text which would serve equally well the purposes of an introductory literature or composition course. It has no true heir in the 1960's because of the variety of cheap paperbacks and the variety of composition courses. The affinity it shares with any modern texts clearly, however, is with the omnibus readers like The Essential Prose, Toward Liberal Education, and The Borzoi College Reader, none of which has as much belletristic material as McCallum's text.

In 1922, however, we find Frederick Smith offering rationales which are still considered valid by editors of the 60's. He sees his collection of essays as prose models for composition and as introductions to liberal education. "The problem [of freshman composition] is, I take it, to teach young folk to think clearly, to write simple and correct English, and to like good books."[17] An even more explicit statement of the efficacy of studying prose models is offered by Frederick Law, also in 1922, who puts forth, in addition, the argument for study of modern writers. His prefatory statement would not be in the least out of place in several anthologies on the market today:

> The type of essay that should be studied in school should concern modern interests; represent the modern point of view; discuss subjects in which young students are interested; be expressed in present-day language and, in general, should set forward an example that pupils may directly and successfully imitate.[18]

Turning the clock back still further, we find James Bowman, Louis Bredvold, L. B. Greenfield, and Bruce Weirick offering, in 1915, the prose model rationale for Essays For College English. Equally arresting is the rationale for GEORGE RICE Carpenter, and WILLIAM Brewster's Modern English Prose, published in 1904:

> Our aim has been to present a rich store of material . . . to provide illustration for all the main forms of composition . . . . Though the book may be used by itself, it can also be made supplementary to any of the standard treatises on rhetoric. (v)

Clearly, offering prose models for analysis in one text and supplementing the text with a rhetoric is not a particularly new idea.

Perhaps the most revealing evidence that there is really nothing new under the sun in the teaching of written composition, at least in the use of readers, comes from John Genung's preface to his Handbook of Rhetorical Analysis (Boston, 1888) the text Kitzhaber calls the ancestor of modern essay anthologies.[19]

> The selections that make up this Handbook, while fairly representative, so far as they go, of the authors from whose works they are taken, are not to be regarded as introductions to the authors as such, still less as studies in the history and development of English prose literature. They are simply, as the title indicates, extracts to be analyzed, in style and structure, for the purpose of forming, from actual examples, some intelligent conception of what the making of good literature involves: taken from the best writers, because it is safer to study models of excellence than examples of error; taken from several writers, because it is not wise to make an exclusive model of any one author's work, however excellent; and taken for the most part from recent writers, not because these are better than writers of earlier time, but because they are more likely to illustrate the usages practically needed in this century. (v)

Could any modern textbook offer any more succinct statement of the pedagogical utility and efficiency of studying classics, many authors, and contemporary writers primarily in prose writing courses? Lift this paragraph and recast it in modern idiom and one has the introduction, or parts of it, to any number of modern textbooks.

It is quite clear that, in their eighty-year history, the kind of anthologies I have been studying have offered most consistently the pedagogical rationale that the imitation or analysis o~~f~~r both of prose models has been the heart and core of their utility in teaching written composition. At least, that is the assumption upon which compilers of those essay collections have worked. An explicit modern statement of this position comes from the editors of The Essential Prose:

> Chaucer, Shakespeare, Milton, and a host of other classical English authors furnished their minds and learned their craftsmanship from works in other languages or works translated from other languages. . . . Perhaps the greatest classic in our tongue is the King James version of the Bible—a translation from the Hebrew and Greek. Out of the matrix of that translation has come the idiom of some of our greatest American writers, as of Herman Melville in the nineteenth century and William Faulkner in the twentieth. (vii)

Now, the defense here is really of the use of translations, but beneath it lies the assumption that great writers acquired certain characteristics of thought and style from their reading. Without question this is true. But how, exactly, did it happen? What was the chemistry that went on in their brains that enabled them to absorb and turn to their own use the rhythms, accents, words, and other stylistic characteristics of great writers while at the same time they developed the style which became distinctively their own? What is important is *not* what one is able to *analyze* in another's work but the process of transformation which turns, let us say, the brain stuff of the *King James Bible* into Herman Melville's style. Analysis of the *Bible* will not yield that. A lack of clarity about the precise way in which the imitation and analysis of prose models effectively teaches better writing has not been confined to textbooks of the 1960's. Adams Sherman Hill, explaining to his contemporaries the rationale for Harvard's requirement in English composition said, in 1879, "It was hoped that this requirement would effect several desirable objects--that the student, by becoming familiar with a few works holding a high place in English literature, would acquire a taste for good reading, and would *insensibly* [italics mine] adopt better methods of thought and better forms of expression."[20]

I believe that teachers of written composition have told themselves that imitation of prose models, or more significantly, close critical analysis of professional essays is the most effective way to teach composition so long that they have ceased to examine the proposition critically, to become aware of some very basic fallacies in it. Gordon Rohman and Albert Wlecke of Michigan State University expose the vulnerability of these basic assumptions with vigor and commanding logic:

> A failure to make a useful distinction between thinking-as-discovery and writing has led to a fundamental misconception which undermines many of our best efforts to teach writing: that if we train students how to recognize an example of good prose (the rhetoric of the finished word), we have given them a basis on which to build their own writing abilities. All we have done, in fact, is to give them standards to judge the goodness or badness of their finished effort. We have not really taught them how to make that effort.[21]

Precisely. Their point is so significant that I cannot let it pass without an illustrative analogy. They remind us implicitly that analysis is the picking apart of a thing whereas the activity we call writing is a synthesizing activity, the putting together of something. Someone may argue, however, that this is the way we learn. A garage mechanic learns to assemble a transmission by first taking one apart then putting it back together. But this is not a valid analogy for the process of picking apart a piece of professional writing then writing an essay of one's own. The student is in the position of picking apart the transmission of one car and then needing to make the parts and fit them together for his own transmission. That is quite another and more complex problem.[22] T. S. Eliot has made a similar observation about the writing of poetry:

> I have never been able to retain the names of feet and meters, or to pay the proper respect to the accepted rules of scansion. . . . This is not to say that I consider the analytical study of metric, of the abstract forms which sound so extraordinarily different when handled by different poets, to be utter waste of time. It is only that a study of anatomy will not teach you how to make a hen lay eggs.[23]

The important point for editors and users of prose anthologies is that the most basic pedagogical premise upon which most are predicated is suspect and, as I pointed out at the beginning of this study, Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, and Schoer's Research in Written Composition indicates that no meaningful studies of the effect of studying prose models on written composition have yet been done. They should be, and soon.

We may ask, finally, what claims can the prose anthologies make? What positive values do they serve in composition classes? I see three functions which these books really do serve. First, they can initiate liberal education. The range and quality of the essays in the best readers is indicative of some of the best that has been written and thought in western culture (and in some instances in eastern culture, too) and students do respond intellectually to these materials. Second, aside from their content value, these readers do introduce students to good writing. Clearly, the nature of each student's aesthetic response to good writing varies tremendously with the student's intellectual ability and his literary sophistication. Exactly what the best of our students absorb and transform into their own idiom from good writing, is, as I have pointed out, the phenomenon we do not fully understand yet. Finally, the essays in these anthologies do serve as material for analysis when the instructor wishes to introduce students to the methods of literary criticism.

Any reader which claims no more than these things, to offer a liberal education, introduction to good writing, and materials for literary analysis has not stepped beyond the bounds of what it can legitimately claim to do. Only when editors assert that analyses of the materials in their texts will necessarily lead to better writing by students do they claim more than they justifiably can. To my knowledge, no anthology is yet on the market which can claim that.

###

NOTES

[1] This study was supported by a grant from the NCTE's Research Foundation in honor of J. N. Hook.

[2] For a thorough study and analysis of freshman composition programs in America, see Albert Kitzhaber, *Themes, Theories, and Therapy*, (New York, 1963). Of special relevance to rhetoric courses is Edward P. J. Corbett's "What Is Being Revived?" *College Composition and Communication*, XVIII, No. 3 (October, 1967), 166-172. He offers a brief history of rhetoric as a discipline and then asks some provocative questions about the new directions which it may or may not be taking.

[3] Kitzhaber, 17.

[4] The organization of the table of contents arranged by rhetorical types is not particularly imaginative. The usual headings are employed: exposition, description, process, cause and effect, comparison and contrast, analogy, etc. along with informal essay, humor and satire, etc. The trouble is that some rhetorical modes, description, exposition, and persuasion, are mixed with methods of development, comparison and contrast, cause and effect, definition, etc. and types of essays. The result is some confusion in this index. It is not nearly so purposeful as the organization of content; rather, it seems more an afterthought, a sop to the current interest in rhetoric.

[5] For an excellent example of approaches to criticism in meaningful order in book form, see Wilfred L. Guerin, Earle G. Labor, Lee Morgan, and

John R. Willingham, *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature* (New York, 1966).

[6] Actually, they number the sub-sections straight through from I. to XIII; I have chosen this more convenient method of showing which are the major headings and which the minor.

[7] See my "The Teacher's Responsibility in the Writing Process," *Illinois English Bulletin,* LIII, No. 4 (January, 1966), 14-18.

[8] See S. I. Hayakawa, *Language in Thought and Action* (New York, 1949), 177-180.

[9] Sheridan Baker, "The Error of *Ain't*," *College English*, XXVI, No. 2 (November, 1964), 91-104; Virginia McDavid, "More on Ain't," *College English,* XXVI, No. 2, 104,105.

[10] "The Teacher's Responsibility," 16,17.

[11] "The Current State of Our Ignorance," *College Composition and Communication*, XV, No. 3(October, 1964), 145-147.

[12] As an advisor in the freshman rhetoric program at Illinois, I have had first-hand opportunities to observe the use of language materials in class and to confer with graduate assistants about class responses to it, as well as their own.

[13] There is a lesson in this attitude toward writing for those departments of English which place a higher value on editorial scholarship than on

creative writing, forgetting when they do so that they are rewarding commentators on more than creators of literature. Such are the occasional irrationalities, however, of our profession.

[14] T. S. Eliot, "Tradition and the Individual Talent," *The Sacred Wood* (London, 1920), 58.

[15] I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Mr. Stephen Zelnick and Mrs. Julia Dermin who did most of the laborious work of classifying the contents of these anthologies.

[16] *Introductory Language Essays*,(New York, 1965), viii.

[17] *Essays and Studies; Prose Selections for College Reading* (New York, 1922), vii.

[18] *Modern Essays and Stories* (New York, 1923), vi,vii.

[19] See the unpubl. diss. (Washington, 1953) by Kitzhaber, "Rhetoric in American Colleges and Universities: 1850-1900," 147. It is an indispensible work for all persons seriously involved in the administration of writing programs.

[20] "An Answer to the Cry for More English," *Twenty Years of School and College English*, cited by Kitzhaber, *Rhetoric in American Colleges*, 58.

[21] "Pre-Writing: The Construction and Application of Models for Concept Formation in Writing," U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare Cooperative Research Project 2174 (East Lansing, 1964), 17.

[22] It will not do to assert that teaching the four forms of discourse or rhetorical methods of development (even as refined as those methods are by Professor Larson) is teaching students to put ideas together. What one really does is to provide the frames before half-formed notions or unclear ideas have developed into concepts. Rohman's study, which has drawn on recent knowledge of creativity for some of its materials, attempts to give students methods for forming concepts, the basic building blocks which can then be manipulated and developed in an essay.

[23] "The Music of Poetry," the W. P. Ker Memorial Lecture, University of Glasgow, February 24, 1942. Reprinted in the Partisan Review, IX, No. 6 (Nov.-Dec., 1942), 453.

APPENDIX A*

The 77 readers represented in the study

Albrecht, Robert. *Patterns of Style in Exposition and Argument*. Philadelphia, 1967.

Altshuler, Thelma, Martha McConough, and Audrey Roth. *Prose As Experience*. New York, 1965

Amend, V. E. and L. T. Hendrick. *Ten Contemporary Thinkers*. New York, 1967.

Anderson, Wallace L. and Norman C. Stageberg. *Introductory Readings on Language*. New York, 1966.

Archer, Jerome, and J. A. Schwartz. *Exposition*. New York, 1966.

________________. *A Reader for Writers*. New York, 1962.

Bailey, Dudley. *Introductory Language Essays*. New York, 1965.

Baker, Sheridan. *The Essayist.* New York, 1963.

Barry, James D. and W. U. McDonald, Jr. *Language Into Literature.* Chicago, 1965.

Beal, Richard, and Jacob Korg. *The Complete Reader*. Englewood Cliffs, 1961.

________________. *Thought in Prose*. Englewood Cliffs, 1966.

Berry, Thomas E. *Values in American Culture*. New York, 1966.

Birk, Newman P. and Genevieve. *Readings for Understanding and Using English*. New York, 1959.

Blair, Walter, and John Gerber. *Factual Prose*. Chicago, 1963.

Braddock, Richard. *Introductory Readings on the English Language*. Englewood Cliffs, 1962.

Chambers, R. and C. King. *A Book of Essays*. New York, 1963.

Clayes, Stanley A., and David G. Spencer. *Contexts for Composition*. New York, 1965.

*With a few exceptions, the latest date of printing is given.

Connolly, Francis X. *Man and His Measure*. New York, 1964.

Cook, Don L., James Justus, and Wallace E. Williams. *The Current Voice*. Englewood-Cliffs, 1966.

Cox, Martha Heasely. *A Reading Approach to College Writing*. San Francisco, 1965.

Davis, Robert G. *Ten Masters of the Modern Essay*. New York, 1966.

Decker, Randall. *Patterns of Exposition*. Boston, 1966.

Douglas, Wallace. *The Character of Prose*. New York, 1959.

Eastman, A. M. and others. *The Norton Reader*. New York, 1965.

Frank, Joseph. *Modern Essays in English*. Boston, 1966.

Frank, Robert, and Harrison T. Meserole. *The Critical Question*. Boston, 1964.

Frazer, Ray, and Harold Kelling. *The Essay in Modern Perspective*. Boston, 1965.

Gaskin, James R. and Jack Suberman. *A Language Reader for Writers*. Englewood-Cliffs, 1966.

Gibson, Walker. *The Limits of Language.* New York, 1962.

Guerard, Albert J., Maclin Guerard, John Hawkes, and Claire Rosenfield. *The Personal Voice*. Philadelphia, 1964.

Guth, Hans. *Essay*. Belmont, 1962.

Hamalian, Leo, and Edmond L. Volpe. *Essays of Our Time.* New York, 1963.

Hogan, Robert, and Herbert Bogart. *The Plain Style*. New York, 1967.

Hughes, Richard, and P. Albert Duhamel. *Persuasive Prose*. Englewood-Cliffs, 1964.

Hunt, Kellogg, and Paul Stoakes. *Our Living Language*. New York, 1967.

Johnson, Willoughby, and T. M. Davis. *College Reading and College Writing*. Chicago, 1966.

Jones, William M. *Stages of Composition: A College Reader*. Boston, 1964.

Kane, Thomas, and Leonard Peters. *Writing Prose*. New York, 1964.

Kazin, Alfred. *The Open Form*. New York, 1961.

Kerr, Elizabeth, and Ralph Aderman. *Aspects of American English.* New York, 1963.

King, Roma, and Frederick R. McLeod. *A Reader for Composition.* New York, 1962.

Kreuzer, James, and Lee Cogan. *Literature for Composition.* New York, 1965.

____________________________. *Studies in Prose Writing.* New York, 1966.

Laird, Charlton, and Robert M. Gorrell. *English As Language: Backgrounds, Development, Usage.* New York, 1961.

Laser, Marvin, Robert S. Cathcart, and Fred H. Marcus. *Ideas and Issues.* New York, 1963.

Lee, Donald. *English Language Reader.* New York, 1963.

__________, and William T. Moynihan. *Using Prose.* New York, 1961.

Locke, Louis, William Gibson, and George Arms. *Toward a Liberal Education.* New York, 1967.

Ludwig, Richard. *Essays Today V.* New York, 1962.

Macrorie, Ken. *Four in Depth.* New York, 1963.

Marcus, M. and H. F. Salerno. *Cross Section.* New York, 1963.

Martin, Harold C. and Richard Ohman. *Inquiry and Expression.* New York, 1963.

Matson, Floyd. *Voices of Crisis.* New York, 1967.

Miles, Josephine. *Classic Essays in English.* Boston, 1965.

Morris, William E. *Form and Focus:2.* New York, 1964.

Morris, Alton C., Biron Walker, and Philip Bradshaw. *The Modern Essay.* New York, 1965.

Muscatine, Charles, and Marlene Griffith. *The Borzoi College Reader.* New York, 1966.

Pflug, Raymond. *The Ways of Language.* New York, 1967.

Polletta, Gregory. *Intention and Choice: The Character of Prose.* New York, 1967.

Rathburn, Robert C., and Martin Steinmann. *75 Prose Pieces.* New York, 1961.

Sachs, H. J., John Milstead, and Harry Brown. *Readings for College Writers.* New York, 1967.

Sanderson, James L., and Walter K. Gordon. *Exposition and the English Language.* New York, 1963.

Schorer, Mark. *Harbrace College Reader.* New York, 1964.

Seat, William, Paul Burtness, and Warren Ober. *The New University Reader.* New York, 1966.

Sheridan, Harriet. *Structure and Style.* New York, 1966.

Shrodes, Caroline, Clifford Josephson, and James Wilson. *Readings for Rhetoric.* New York, 1962.

Silberstein, Suzanne, and Marian Seldin. *Sense and Style.* New York, 1962.

Smart, W. *Eight Modern Essayists.* New York, 1965.

Steinmann, Martin Jr., and Gerald Willen. *Literature for Writing.* Belmont, 1962.

Stone, Wilfred, and Robert Hoopes. *Form and Thought in Prose.* New York, 1960.

Strandness, T. Benson, Herbert Hackett, and Harry Crosby. *Language, Form, and Idea.* New York, 1964.

Taylor, Warren. *Models for Thinking and Writing.* New York, 1966.

Van Ghent, Dorothy, and Willard Maas. *The Essential Prose.* Indianapolis, 1965.

Walkins, Floyd, and Karl F. Knight. *Writer to Writer.* New York, 1966.

Wasson, John. *Subject and Structure.* Boston, 1966.

Williams, W. E. *A Book of English Essays.* Baltimore, 1963.

Woodward, Robert. *The Craft of Prose.* Belmont, 1963.

APPENDIX B

Seventeen Early Readers

Alden, Raymond M. Essays, English and American. New York, 1920.

Berdan, John M. and others. Modern Essays. New York, 1915.

Blanks, Anthony Faulkner. Essay Backgrounds for Writing and Speaking. New York, 1929.

Bowman, James C. Louis Bredvold, L. B. Greenfield, and Bruce Weirick. Essays for College English. Boston, 1915.

Brewster, William T. Studies in Structure and Style. New York, 1896.

Carpenter, George Rice, and William T. Brewster. Modern English Prose. New York, 1906.

Bronson, Walter C. English Essays. New York, 1905.

Cairns, William B. The Forms of Discourse. Boston, 1896.

Gardiner, John H. The Forms of Prose Literature. New York, 1900.

Genung, John F. Handbook of Rhetorical Analysis: Studies in Style and Invention. Boston, 1888.

Heydrick, Benjamin A. Types of the Essay. New York, 1921.

Law, Frederick H. Modern Essays and Stories. New York, 1923.

McCallum, James Dow. The College Omnibus. New York, 1933.

McLaughlin, Edward T. Literary Criticism for Students. New York, 1893.

Pritchard, Francis Henry. Essays of Today: An Anthology. Boston, 1924.

Scott, Fred N.,and Joseph Denney. Composition--Literature. Boston, 1902.

Smith, Frederick M. Essays and Studies: Prose Selections for College Reading. New York, 1922.

APPENDIX C

Selected Bibliography

Braddock, Richard, Richard Lloyd-Jones, and Lowell Schoer. *Research in Written Composition*. Champaign, 1963.

Bruner, Jerome. *On Knowing, Essays for the Left Hand*. Cambridge, 1962.

Corbett, Edward P. J. "What Is Being Revived?" *College Composition and Communication*, XVIII, No. 3 (October, 1967), 166-172.

Hooker, Bessie R. "The Use of Literary Material in Teaching Composition," *School Review*, X(June, 1902), 474-485.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. *Rhetoric in American Colleges and Universities*: 1850-1900. unpub. doc. diss. Seattle, 1953.

________________. *Themes, Theories, and Therapy*. New York, 1963.

Rohman, D. Gordon, and Albert O. Wlecke. *Pre-Writing: The Construction and Application of Models for Concept Formation in Writing*. Cooperative Research Project 2174 of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. East Lansing, 1964.

APPENDIX D

List of authors represented 10 or more times in the anthologies.

Addison, Joseph-15
Agee, James-19
Arnold, Matthew-27
Auden, W. H.-31
Bacon, Francis-33
Baldwin, James-30
Barzun, Jacques-15
Baugh, Albert C.-11
Becker, Carl-20
Beerbohm, Max-18
Blake, William-14
Browning, Robert-15
Camus, Albert-17
Carson, Rachel-10
Chase, Stuart-11
Chesterton, G. K.-11
Ciardi, John-16
Clemens Samuel-34
Conrad, Joseph-14
DeQuincey, Thomas-14
Dickinson, Emily-21
Donne, John-25
Eiseley, Loren-14
Eliot, T. S.-22

Emerson, Ralph Waldo-21
Evans, Bergen-18
Faulkner, William-19
Forster, E. M.-41
Franklin, Benjamin-13
Fromm, Erich-13
Frost, Robert-22
Gold, Herbert-14
Graves, Robert-10
Hardy, Thomas-25
Hawthorne, Nathaniel-11
Hayakawa, S. I.-11
Hazlitt, William-16
Hemingway, Ernest-16
Highet, Gilbert-12
Hopkins, Gerard Manly-18
Housman, A.E.-14
Hutchins, Robert M.-17
Huxley, Aldous-28
Huxley, Julian-11
Huxley, Thomas H.-25
James, Henry-16
James, William-16
Jefferson, Thomas-16